



252 5454

---

## Keep Your Card in This Pocket

---

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for four weeks. Borrowers finding books marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on his card.

Penalty for over-due books 2c a day plus cost of notices.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



# PUBLIC LIBRARY

Kansas City, Mo.

---

## Keep Your Card in This Pocket

---



# Five Present-Day Controversies

MAI APR 19 1976

MAI NOV 26 1976 By

CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, D.D. LL. D.

*Pastor, The Broadway Tabernacle, New York*

APR 9 1977

MAI FEB 17 1979

MAI MAR 10 1979 R



OCT 15 1994

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

Fleming H. Revell Company

LONDON AND EDINBURGH

Copyright, 1924, by  
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

*Printed in the United States of America*

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue  
Chicago: 17 North Wabash Ave.  
London: 21 Paternoster Square  
Edinburgh: 75 Princes Street



## Contents

PREFACE .. . . .	9
I. TWO VIEWS OF THE BIBLE . . . .	19
II. EVOLUTION AND THE BOOK OF GENESIS .	47
III. THE VIRGIN BIRTH . . . . .	73
IV. THE USE OF CREEDS . . . . .	109
V. ROMAN CATHOLICISM AND THE KU KLUX KLAN . . . . .	141



JOHN CHADWICK was born in 1920 and educated at St. Paul's School and Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. During the war he served in the Royal Navy as an Officer in the Special Branch. After the war he returned to Cambridge to take his degree, and for a time worked on the staff of the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, returning to Cambridge to lecture in Classics in 1952.

From 1952 he collaborated with Ventris in the progress of the decipherment of Linear B; he was part author with Ventris of *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*. He has written articles in various journals and newspapers, and has broadcast. He is a corresponding member of the German Archaeological Institute of Berlin.

rance of the way in which the Church has advanced and added new dimensions to her life. All the Old Testament prophets were controversialists. They were in perpetual conflict, not only with the representatives of pagan religions round about them, but with men inside the Jewish Church. If the prophets had not contended unceasingly with the priests, the Jewish religion would have been smothered under ceremony and tradition.

All through His brief earthly career Christ was in controversy with the religious leaders of His day. He had certain ideas which He wished to establish, and He could not establish them without combating the ideas of prominent contemporaries. All His Apostles were controversialists, and they accepted their fate as something which Christ foretold. "Do not think," He had said, as He sent them out, "that your work will go forward in the midst of tranquillity. It will not be peace, but a sword. You will make your way in the midst of dissension, and controversies will tear even families to pieces."

Paul was one of the mightiest controversialists of all history. If he had not fought with all his might against men in the Church whose ideas he felt sure made void the Gospel of Christ, the Christian religion might have been strangled in its cradle. Only dead ages in history have been quiet. Whenever the Church is awake it is a Church militant, combating false or outgrown ideas, always con-

tending for a larger and fuller life. The ages in which it has been peculiarly alert and mentally aggressive, are the ages in which strong men have contended valiantly for ideas which clashed with current opinion.

The Nicene Creed is a product of controversy. The ablest men in the Church were divided, and the conception of Christ's relation to God had to be worked out. The result of the contest is embodied in the Nicene Creed.

Our New Testament Canon was arrived at after long discussion. Some of our books with difficulty got in, and others almost got in and finally failed. How could a Canon of Scripture ever have been formed if keen and discriminating minds had not by mental toil achieved clean-cut conclusions, and then been willing to defend these conclusions against all comers? It is foolish, therefore, to disparage or to fear controversy. It may not be pleasant, but it works out many a blessing. Those who sniff at it, and call it a squabble or a wrangle or a quarrel or a futile waste of time, do not set a high value on truth. They prefer tranquility to intellectual progress. Because controversialists fall sometimes into ugly moods, some persons conclude that all controversy is of the devil. If a man cannot defend his position without losing his temper, and using bitter and un-christian words, it is not because controversy is a bad thing, but because he has an undisciplined spirit. It is not stating the

truth and contending for it which has brought controversy into disrepute, but the petty and mean ways in which discussion has often been conducted by men who could not control their tongue, because they had never subdued their heart to the law of Christ. Controversy is a wholesome and advantageous thing when rival ideas or ideals are up for consideration, and he is not the highest type of Christian who is unwilling to pay whatever price such controversies involve.

For the last twenty years we have had quite too little controversy in our American Churches. We have, in order to escape dissension, allowed many things to drift. Our pulpit leaders have in too many cases kept silence on matters which ought to have been discussed, and have allowed traditions to retain their grip on minds which should have been delivered from them. It is a shame, for instance, that so many American Christians are belated in their view of the Scriptures. The seventeenth century theory of Inspiration is absolutely untenable—as completely discredited among those who know the facts as is the Ptolemaic astronomy. That theory must go, and every minister to whom the light has come, ought to do what he can to drive it out of the human mind. Either the Bible is inerrant, or it is not. Those who believe it is not, are under bonds as lovers of the truth to build their conviction into the minds of those who are mistaken.

Is Christianity tied up to any particular theory of the method of creation? Is the Bible a book of science? Is the Book of Genesis in its ideas of creation binding on Christians? These are questions which will not down. They are important questions and deserve an answer. It is no more possible to laugh them down than it is to laugh back the tide. Why should we wish to ignore them? Why not face them and answer them? There are men of distinction who are doing their utmost to make the Bible a book of science, and to saddle on the Christian Church interpretations and conclusions which Christianity is not able to carry. Shall we let these men go unanswered? Shall we be content to busy ourselves with so-called social service, using our hands and our feet, allowing these great questions of the mind to go unnoticed? That is the way to lose the new generation. Old people sometimes get tired of thinking, but young people never do. Youth has boundless curiosity concerning scientific questions, and thousands of young people want to know about the old stories in Genesis. Alas for the preacher who has nothing to say on these matters!

Was Jesus born of a virgin? Had Jesus an earthly father? Is it necessary to believe in the Virgin Birth in order to be a Christian—a church member—a minister of Christ? How dare we turn our back on questions like these? They are among the most practical questions of our day. They can-

not be ignored. Somebody must answer them. Who is going to answer them if Christian ministers keep silence? To run away from them is cowardice.

What are we going to do with the Apostles' Creed? Shall we banish it from public worship? Is it dishonest to give old phrases new meanings? Is a man a hypocrite when he says he believes in the resurrection of the body, when the men who wrote that article believed one thing and he believes another? These are questions which thoughtful people all over the country are asking, and they have a right to ask them, and it is the duty of leaders of the Church to answer them. How can a man be a leader if he refuses to lead? How can he clarify the minds of others unless he clarifies his own, and having clarified it, sets forth his conclusions in language which all can understand?

Along with these questions of theology, there are questions of policy concerning which many minds are confused. One of them is—"What is the best way of curbing the encroachments of the Roman Catholic hierarchy?" Just now, it is unusually confident and aggressive. In various parts of Europe it is working with a vigour unknown since the Reformation, and in our own country it is pushing its ideas on the public mind, and putting forward efforts to enhance its prestige and its power with a cleverness and boldness which are exciting widespread alarm. What is the wise thing



to do? Millions of American citizens believe that the only effective way of overcoming this mighty ecclesiastical machine, is by an oath-bound secret organisation. In this organisation are found members and ministers of our Protestant denominations. Are they pursuing a justifiable course? Is this the Christian thing to do? Here, then, is another question which demands an answer. It is easy to pass on and say nothing. But is that what a Christian minister ought to do? Membership in such an organisation is wise or it is foolish, and the leaders of the Christian Church ought to have an opinion in regard to it. If they have an opinion then laymen have a right to know what that opinion is.

These are five of the great controversies of our day. I did not prepare these discourses with the intention of publishing them, but the demand for them has been so urgent, and has come from so many parts of the country that I am giving them to the publisher with the hope that whether all my readers agree or not with the conclusions I have arrived at, they may be stimulated by what I have written to think more earnestly and fruitfully on these high and perplexing themes.

C. E. J.

*New York.*



I

TWO VIEWS OF THE BIBLE



# I

## TWO VIEWS OF THE BIBLE \*

**I**N the first chapter of his Second Letter to the Corinthians, the Apostle Paul uses an expression which to me seems an admirable statement of the function of a Christian minister. He says to his Corinthian friends—"We do not have lordship over your faith, we are helpers of your joy." He has written somewhat positively, as was his custom to do, and on reading it over, what he has written sounds a trifle dogmatic, and so he throws in this apologetic sentence—"We"—that is, Silas, Timothy and I—"do not want to lord it over your faith, we are simply helpers of your joy. You stand fast in your own faith." In other words, every man must have a faith of his own. No other man can give it to him, but another man may be able to help him clarify his faith, strengthen it, and defend it. That is the function I hope to perform in these sermons. I shall not attempt to dictate to anybody what he is under obligation to believe, but I should like to assist him in arriving at con-

---

\* Preached in the Broadway Tabernacle, Sunday morning, February 3, 1924.

## 20 FIVE PRESENT-DAY CONTROVERSIES

clusions which will contribute to his freedom and peace and joy.

We begin with the Bible. The Bible is the storm-centre of the religious world in our generation. All the great religious controversies which are now raging are rooted in the Scriptures. There are two views of the Bible contending for supremacy, or, in other words, two views of Inspiration. No body of men in the Christian Church is denying the inspiration of the Bible. That point is not up for discussion. All members of our Evangelical Churches are agreed that the Bible is inspired—that it is the greatest book in the world, the best book and the most useful—the immeasurably precious treasure of the Christian Church. The only question which is stirring the minds of thoughtful men today is the question as to *how* the Bible is inspired. What is the nature of the inspiration, and to what extent does it go? Before one plunges into any controversy, it is desirable that he should see clearly just what the point at issue is. The question before us is—"What theory of Inspiration shall we hold?"

The first theory about which we are to think may be called the "dictation" theory. According to this theory, the Bible is a dictated book. It was dictated by God. God wanted to deliver a message to mankind, and so He chose certain men to whom He dictated His message, and the men have written down His message in documents which constitute

our present Bible. This view of the Bible is clear, and easily understood. We know what dictation means. When a man dictates a message he makes use of an amanuensis. The amanuensis does not supply any of the ideas or any of the words. The message belongs entirely to the man who does the dictating, and the message is his from beginning to end. If a man does not have an amanuensis he uses his own pen. The pen is an instrument in his hand—not at all responsible for what he says. And just so is an amanuensis an instrument which the dictator makes use of. He is a “pen man.” According to one view of the Bible, the men who wrote the Bible were “pen men.” God dictated the message and these men wrote it down.

According to this theory, the Bible is God's Book. It is not man's book. It is a Divine book and not a human book. It is the “Word of God.” That is a title which has been applied to it for hundreds of years. Many persons still make use of it. It is an appropriate title to use if you hold the dictation theory. If the Bible is a dictated book, the whole Bible belongs to God. Every book of the sixty-six books is His, and every paragraph and every sentence in every book. They are all His, and because they are His, they are equally authoritative. In a book which God has dictated there can be no errors. Infinite Wisdom could not dictate mistakes. If God dictated the Bible, then the Bible is infallible. It is the final authority.

You cannot go beyond the Bible for the reason that you cannot go beyond God. God, in the Scriptures, has given the world His final message. This is the dictation theory stated in the baldest terms. Very few persons probably hold it in that extreme form. Whenever a large number of people hold any theory, they hold it with different degrees of tenacity and strictness. The dictation theory has many modifications. Almost every one is willing to admit that there are errors in the Bible which is in our possession.

For many hundred years the Bible was transcribed from one skin to another by copyists, and it was impossible to keep errors from creeping in. There are errors in the Bible due to the carelessness of copyists. Moreover, the Bible has been translated from two languages into English, and the translators were not infallible. They have here and there made mistakes. Every one is willing to grant that there are errors in the Scripture due to the fallibility of translators. And then many persons are willing to admit that it was ideas and not words which God dictated. God gave an idea, and allowed His amanuensis to clothe it as he chose. Every Bible writer was at liberty to make use of his own vocabulary, and to employ his own individual style. In this way we can account for the fact that Isaiah writes in one way, Jeremiah in another, and that both of them differ widely from Amos and Hosea. We all know that Paul does not write like



John, nor John like Peter, from which we may infer that God did not dictate words. His dictation was confined to the ideas. The old doctrine of verbal dictation has well-nigh disappeared. But after all these modifications have been made, this theory remains—the dictation theory. The Bible is the “Word of God”—authoritative in its every part—the infallible guide of mankind.

This is the traditional view of that part of the Christian world in which we have all grown up. This was the view, if not of our fathers and mothers, at least of our grandparents. Nearly every one of us can remember some saintly grandfather or grandmother, or uncle or aunt, who made a practice of reading the Bible through every year, beginning always with the Book of Genesis, and never halting until arriving at the end of Revelation. To be sure it was hard reading in many places, but this did not deter the brave-hearted Bible reader. It was very dull in Leviticus, and very dry in Numbers. There were long stretches of desert in the Books of the Chronicles, but the reader plodded patiently forward, feeling that God must be pleased because such reverence was being shown to His Word. These good people of the earlier day read the Bible after this fashion, because the preachers held the dictation theory. They believed the whole Bible to be the Word of God, and had no hesitation in dipping into the Scriptures at any point for a sentence by which to establish

any idea which they wished to lodge in the minds of their hearers. Many of the sermons preached a hundred and two hundred years ago are insufferably dull to us because they are little more than a string of Biblical quotations. The minister started out with something he wished to prove, and he proved it by making a miscellaneous collection of quotations taken from all parts of the Bible. Esther was just as authoritative as Isaiah, and First Kings was as reliable as Hosea. The earliest portions of the Old Testament stood on the same level as the latest portions of the New Testament, because all alike were the Word of God. The preacher used the Bible in this way because this was the way in which the theologians used it. When you pick up the Confessions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, you find that every article in them is supported by quotations from the Scriptures. It is interesting to note that no distinction whatever is made between the Old Testament and the New, or between one Book of the Old Testament and another Book. The theologians made no distinction when it came to quoting the Scriptures, for the reason that it was their conviction that all the Books of the Bible were the Word of God. This, then, is the traditional view, and it survives to the present hour. There are many people in all parts of the country who hold the dictation theory of Inspiration, and in some parts of the country it is the dominant view.

Whenever you hear a person say he "believes the Bible from cover to cover," or that he "always takes the Bible as it reads," you may confidently infer that that person holds the dictation theory of Inspiration. When you hear any one say that "the Bible which was good enough for his mother and his grandmother is good enough for him," you may conclude that that person believes that the whole Bible is the authoritative and infallible Word of God.

Over against this dictation theory of Inspiration, there is another theory, and for lack of a better word I am going to call it the "illumination theory." According to this theory God is Light, and since God is Light, the Holy Spirit is Light, and when the Holy Spirit comes into a human mind, that mind is lighted up, or, as we usually say, "inspired." A man is inspired when he sees things more clearly than other men see them, or when he sees some things which other men do not see at all. If a man sees more or less clearly spiritual realities and spiritual distinctions and spiritual relations which escape the attention of the average man, we call that man inspired. The men who wrote the Bible were inspired because their minds were lighted up by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

According to this theory there must be degrees of inspiration just as there are degrees of illumination. You can illumine a room brilliantly, or you

can illumine a room partially, or you can illumine a room very dimly. You may let all the gas jets burn, or you may turn half the gas jets out, or you may allow only one gas jet to burn. In the first case, you will see everything in the room with great distinctness. In the second case you will see many things clearly while other things lie in shadow. In the last case many things will escape your eyes. And so if we accept the theory of illumination, we are not reluctant to admit that some Bible writers were more illumined than others. Some saw distinctly, and some saw only dimly. And because of this difference in the degree of illumination we cannot put all the Bible books on the same level. They are not all equally authoritative. They are not equally binding on the conscience of living men. There was some light in the minds of the patriarchs, but not sufficient for them to be greatly troubled because they were polygamists or because when it served their purpose they could tell lies. There was more light in the minds of the judges, especially Samuel, and there was still more light in the minds of the prophets, while the illumination became far more intense in the minds of the Apostles. And when we come to Jesus of Nazareth we find His whole mind so flooded with light that He could say—"I am the light of the world."

If we hold the theory of illumination, we are able to conceive that Inspiration must be progres-

sive. Truth comes into the minds of men as the sun comes into the eyes of the world. The dawn begins with only the faintest tinge of light low down in the eastern sky, but little by little the sun climbs, crowning first the hills with glory, and later on filling the deepest valleys with light. Thus came the Sun of Righteousness into the consciousness of the human race. At first the light was faint and uncertain, but little by little it grew until things that could not be seen at all at first, became later on clear as the sun at noon.

If Inspiration is indeed progressive, we shall not be surprised to find that in the earlier stages of Hebrew history there were many crudenesses of conception, and many rudenesses of conduct, which have long since been left behind. Because the Jews believed a certain thing in the morning of their national life, it does not follow that that idea is still binding on us; and because good men did certain things three or four thousand years ago, it does not follow that they are examples for men of our own generation. Many things in the Bible have long since been outgrown. Many ideas have been exploded, and many practices have been discarded. We all see, without difficulty, that the great mass of Levitical ritualistic legislation does not belong to us. The civil legislation of the Jews has also been left behind, the political ideas are antiquated, all of the science of the Bible has been outgrown, many of the moral ideas of

the Scriptures have been left far behind. This is because Inspiration is progressive, and the Spirit is guiding humanity into wider ranges of truth. According to this theory of Inspiration, we are not to consider the Bible as the "Word of God," but rather the literary record of the progressive revelation of the character and purposes of the Eternal.

Possibly, at this point, some one may ask what difference does it make which of these two theories a man holds? The answer is that up to a certain point it makes no difference whether a man believes in the Ptolemaic astronomy or the Copernican astronomy. He may believe that the earth is flat, or he may believe that it is round, and in both cases he can live a happy and successful life. In my boyhood I knew a farmer in Western Pennsylvania who held the Ptolemaic theory. He was a sensible man, and a noble man—a member of the Christian Church, and respected and honoured by all who knew him. But he steadfastly maintained that the earth was flat, and that the sun and moon and stars revolved around it. He believed all this because the Bible said so. The Bible, to him, was the "Word of God," and he was unwilling to accept the opinions of the astronomers when they set up their opinions against the opinions expressed in the Scriptures. And what harm did this do him? He sheared his sheep, and fed his pigs just like all the other farmers, and got just as much pork and wool

as any of them got. He sowed his grain and reaped his grain just as his neighbours did, and his barns were just as full as theirs. The seasons came and went for him, as they did for other men—summer following spring and spring coming after winter, and winter following autumn. Spring laid her blossoms at his feet; summer filled his lap with fruits; autumn stored his barns with grain; and winter spread over his fields a blanket of spotless white. The sun rose and set for him; the moon waxed and waned for him; and the constellations—cohorts in the shining army of the Lord of hosts—marched nightly across the fields of blue for him. And so it is with one's view of Inspiration. One man may believe that the Bible is a dictated book, and the other man believe that it is an illumined book; and both men will find it a lamp to their feet, and a light to their path. To each man it will be meat and drink. To each man it will give comfort, strength and joy—both men by reading it will be able to go down into the valley of the shadow of death saying—"I will fear no evil; for Thou art with me." Both men will be able, because they have feasted on this Book, to say to the King of Terrors—"O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" Up to a certain point it makes no difference to which of these two theories you subscribe.

But if you wish to explain the phenomena presented by the Bible—if you wish to account for

certain things which are to be found in the Bible—then the dictation theory will not serve you. So long as a man simply feeds his pigs and shears his sheep, sows his fields and reaps them, it does not matter whether he follows Ptolemy or Copernicus. But if he wishes to understand why there are eclipses of the sun, and why there are eclipses of the moon; if he wants to explain the motions of the planets; if he wishes to know why the constellations hold one position in midsummer and a different position in midwinter, then he must let the Ptolemaic theory go. He cannot satisfy his mind, if he wishes to use his mind upon the stars, with the theory of Ptolemy. It was the astronomers who first protested against the Ptolemaic theory, and decreed that it must go. It *had* to go because it crumbled in the presence of the facts. It made no difference to the common masses of men whether Ptolemy was right or Copernicus. They could marry, and give in marriage; they could eat, drink and make merry. They could buy and sell and get gain just as readily under the Ptolemaic astronomy as under the Copernican astronomy, but every man who became a student of the stars had to surrender the Ptolemaic theory. He was forced to become a disciple of Copernicus.

So it is with the Bible. The average man is not a student of the Bible. The things he finds in it do not disturb him. He gives his life to certain forms of work, and after working hours he gives



himself up to certain forms of pleasure. The difficulties and mysteries of the Bible do not trouble him. But if a man becomes a student of the Bible and tries to explain it to his own mind, he is obliged to surrender the dictation theory of the Scriptures, and look around for another theory which will fit the facts. That is why the protest against the dictation theory came, first of all, from the Bible scholars in our theological seminaries. Here were groups of men whose business it was to make a study of the Scriptures, and when they studied them earnestly and thoroughly, they discovered that the dictation theory was not tenable.

It is stated in the Scriptures that God made the earth in six days. We are sure He did not dictate that. We are told, once in Exodus and once in Deuteronomy, that He wrote the Ten Commandments with his own finger on two tables of stone. We are convinced that He did not dictate that. It is written by a Hebrew historian in the tenth chapter of the Book of Joshua that in answer to a prayer of Joshua, "the sun hastened not to go down about a whole day." It is not likely that God ever dictated that. When you turn to the New Testament you will find Paul in the fourth chapter of his First Letter to the Thessalonians saying that the Lord is going to come down out of heaven with a shout, and that when He comes the Christians who are dead are going to come out of their graves first, that these risen Christians, along with

the Christians who have not died, are going to be caught up in the clouds where they will meet the Lord in the air. Nothing like that ever happened, and therefore we are very sure God did not dictate that. In the last Book of the New Testament, we find at the very beginning of it these words—"The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him to shew unto his servants, things which must shortly come to pass." Now, many of the things written in the Book of the Revelation did not come to pass, nor have they come to pass yet, nor will some of them ever come to pass, and therefore we may be sure that God did not dictate the last Book in the New Testament. It is difficult to believe that He dictated any of them, and therefore it is our duty to let the dictation theory of the Scriptures go.

But there is still another reason why we must discard the dictation theory, and that is because if we carry it out it leads to scandal and tragedy. Nearly all the scandal and tragedy of Christian history can be traced to the dictation theory of the Bible. Anybody who takes the Bible as the Word of God, and attempts to carry out literally everything that it says, brings mischief upon the world. For instance, in the twenty-second chapter of the Book of Exodus, God is said to have told Moses "not to suffer a witch to live." Many men reading that, concluded that this was a command to them, and so through the centuries there were per-

petrated the most horrible cruelties upon people who were accused of witchcraft. It is estimated that in a single century a hundred thousand innocent men and women suffered death on the charge of witchcraft. The executioners were not heartless and cruel men, but conscientious men, heroically doing their duty, believing that they were carrying out the will of God. In the eighteenth chapter of the First Book of Kings, it is written that Elijah, the prophet, brought four hundred and fifty priests of Baal "down to the brook Kishon and slew them there." The mediæval Church kept the Bible open at that page, and when men led people away from belief in God, the mediæval Church believed that it was its duty to follow the example of Elijah. Elijah was a prophet of God—one of the greatest and most honoured of the prophets—so beloved that at the end of his life, he was taken to heaven in a chariot of fire. If God told Elijah to kill four hundred and fifty priests of Baal, why should not leaders of the Church put to death every man who was discovered destroying the faith of men in God?

The age-long conflict between science and the Church, so discreditable and shameful, is the result of a wrong conception of Inspiration. Ever since the days of Galileo, church leaders and scientists have been arrayed against each other, and in every conflict the leaders of the Church have been routed. They have been wrong every time. If you want to

read the disgraceful story, read Andrew D. White's great volumes on "The Conflict between Science and Theology." One of the reasons why so many young men are biased against Christianity is because of the record which church leaders have made. Their blunders have been due to a false conception of Inspiration.

In the days of Shakespeare these literalists were making infinite mischief, causing Shakespeare to say in one of his plays:

"In religion  
What damned error, but some sober brow  
Will bless it, and approve it with a text."

All through the first half of the nineteenth century, there were Christian men in America proving that slavery was right by quoting from the Bible. Many of the Southern slave-holders were sincere and noble-hearted men, as sincere and noble as any of the Christians of the North, but they held the dictation theory of Inspiration, and it was not difficult for them to gather sentences from Holy Writ to prove that slavery was a divine institution, and that owning slaves was not contrary to the will of Christ. During the Great War, there were theologians and ministers in Germany, and also in this country, who published pamphlets defining war as "an ordinance of God," and they clinched their arguments always with quotations from the Bible. One would have said that it was

incredible that in the twentieth century such an atrocious and damnable thing as war could ever be defended by any Christian man by quoting from the Scriptures.

Eighty years ago there was a fanatic in the State of New York by the name of William Miller who was an enthusiastic student of the Scriptures. He believed that the Bible is the Word of God from cover to cover, and by concentrating his attention largely on the Book of Ezekiel and the Book of Revelation, he came to the conclusion that the end of the world was coming on April 23, 1843. He was so confident and so enthusiastic that he stirred the hearts of men near and far. Men and women became wild over the words he uttered, and enormous meetings were held in New York and throughout New England. Many men gave up their farms. Other men closed their business. In the city of New York the crowds were sometimes so great that passage through the streets was impossible. Shops were closed and placards placed in the windows which read: "This shop is closed in honour of the King of kings, who will appear about the 20th of April. Get ready, friends, to crown Him Lord of All." The Lord did not come on April 23, 1843, as William Miller had confidently proclaimed, and on revising his figures, he discovered that he had made a slight mistake, and that the day which ought to have been announced was October 20, 1844. Of course the Lord did not come either in

1843 or in 1844, and He has not come yet, in any such spectacular and miraculous manner as William Miller expected by a literal reading of the Scriptures. The Miller fanaticism died down, but it flares up again here and there, and just now there are in New York and in many cities throughout the country, ministers of the Christian Gospel—earnest men, educated men, high-minded and noble-hearted men, who are enthusiastically declaring that “the Lord is coming within the lifetime of men who are now alive,” and the pity is that tens of thousands of people are believing what they say. What induces these men to talk such nonsense? It is because they have a false idea of Inspiration. Why are people found who are ready to accept such preaching? It is because they hold the dictation theory of the Bible. We shall never have peace in the Christian Church until we get rid of that mistaken theory.

If so much can be said against the dictation theory of Inspiration, some one might reasonably ask: “Why, then, are people unwilling to accept a theory that is better? Why is it that the illumination theory does not win universal acceptance? How does it come that any considerable number of people will go on holding a theory which is demonstrably false?” The answer to this question is that the illumination theory is not an easy theory to manage. The dictation theory is clear and definite, and any one can easily get hold of it. The

illumination theory is vague and indefinite, and you hardly know what it may lead you into. If, for instance, there are errors in the Bible, how are you going to tell what is error and what is truth? Who will pick out the errors, and who will pick out the truths? If you can be certain of some of the Bible, and not of all of the Bible, who will instruct you where to find the paragraphs that are certain, and the paragraphs that are uncertain? If a part of the Bible is reliable, and another part is unreliable, it would seem that you have no guide at all. Unless your guide is free from error, it would seem to be better not to have any guide. It is because of this feeling that one loses the Bible altogether unless he holds on to it from cover to cover, that many people cling to the dictation theory notwithstanding all that can be said against it.

In answer to this difficulty, it may be said, in the first place, that the illumination theory is no more difficult to manage than is the dictation theory. The fact is, the dictation theory cannot be managed at all. You cannot do anything with it in the presence of the facts. The theory crumbles to pieces in the light of the open Bible. It must be admitted that it is difficult to manage the illumination theory—the theory which teaches that the Books are on different levels, and that some voices are from heaven, and other voices are from earth. It sounds quite final to say that “if there

are errors in the Bible, then you have no guide at all." But this is an instance of what one of my teachers long ago was in the habit of calling "verbal intimidation." We are often intimidated by words. They sound formidable and unanswerable, and we take to our heels and run. If some one asks you if your senses sometimes deceive you, you are obliged to say "Yes." And if some one goes on to say—"How do you know that your senses do not always deceive you?" you are obliged to answer that you do not know. The logical consequence is that you cannot depend on your senses at all. But at that point we refuse to be logical. After we have admitted that our senses sometimes deceive us, and that they might possibly deceive us all the time, we go right on making use of our senses. That is the only sane thing to do.

There are some problems that have no theoretical solution. They are solved only in action. There is an abstract argument against the possibility of motion. You cannot move where you are, and you cannot move where you are not, and therefore you cannot move at all. That was the way in which Plato was arguing one day, and Diogenes did not attempt any theoretical answer. He answered Plato by walking up and down before him. Many of the problems of life must be solved not by arguments, but by walking. When, therefore, some one says—"Does the Bible ever mislead



you?" your answer is "Yes." And if that person further asks—"How do you know that the Bible does not *always* mislead you?" the proper answer is "I do not know." The logical consequence would be to have nothing to do with the Bible, but the sensible thing is to go on and use it. You learn the value of it by using it. You learn the principles of it which you need by using it. If you will only use it faithfully, it will guide you to God. If you will only use it as it ought to be used, it will put your feet on the path that leads to life, and your path will grow brighter and brighter "unto the perfect day."

One of the causes of our trouble is that we think we must have an infallible guide. This is a false assumption. We have never had any infallible guides, and there are no infallible guides anywhere in the world, and yet humanity gets on. Our parents were guides, but they were not infallible. We got on very well under their leadership. There are no infallible professors of science, or philosophy, or history, or language in any of the universities of the world. There have never been infallible teachers in any of the centres of learning. There never has been an infallible book in any of the great world libraries, but the world of education gets on without any infallible guides. We do not need an infallible guide in religion. The Roman Catholics thought they did, and so, in the year 1870, they made it a dogma of their Church

that the Pope is infallible. That is an opinion that had been held by individual Catholics for a long time, but not until 1870 was it proclaimed as a dogma. Many of the wise men of the Church strenuously opposed its passage, but the Italian and Spanish Jesuits pushed it through. Some men were greatly elated, feeling that the Roman Catholic Church would now speak with new power. Others were greatly depressed, feeling that the Catholic Church had discredited itself in the eyes of the most thoughtful. But for fifty-four years, strange to say, the Pope has never once made use of his powers of infallible utterance.

According to the Roman Catholic dogma a Pope speaks infallibly only under these three conditions: (1) He must speak *ex-cathedra*, (2) he must speak on a question of faith or morals, (3) he must speak for the guidance of the whole Church. Not once in all these fifty-four years have these three conditions been met. There have been five popes in this period, and they have issued encyclicals and syllabuses and allocutions, but these are not counted infallible. These can all be modified by future popes. Pius IX was on the papal throne seven years and never spoke once infallibly. Leo XIII was on the throne twenty-six years, Pius X was pope eleven years, Benedictus XV was on the throne eight years, and Pius XI has been pope for over a year, and not one of these five has ever seized the opportunity of making use of his in-

fallible authority. The Roman Catholic Church gets on very well without any infallible utterances. Nor do we need an infallible Bible. We need the kind of Bible that we have. There are errors in it, but they are only minor errors. They do not quench the light that shines in the Book. If any one twits you on the fact that you do not have an infallible Book, the reply is—"I do not need one. The infallible guide is the Spirit of God." And the spirit of God is given to every one who asks for His guidance. We are assured that He will guide us into all the truth that it is necessary for us to know in order to fulfil our obligations to our fellow-men, and to honour our Father Who is in Heaven.

And so we come around to a position which all of us can confidently hold. We can all be sure that the Bible is a useful book. Paul in his letter to Timothy says that "Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work." We can all be sure of that. We can also be certain that it is a reliable book. It is not a book of falsehoods. It is not a book of fables and myths. This book was written by honest men. They expressed Truth as they saw it. They had no intention to deceive or mislead. They walked by the light that they had. They tell us the best that they knew. It

is a trustworthy book. And you can read it with great confidence that you are listening to the words of honest men. You can be sure that it is an inspired book. When some one says that the Bible is no more inspired than Shakespeare, he does not know either Shakespeare or the Bible. That is one of the stupidest things that a man can say. We can be sure that it is an authoritative book. It speaks as one having authority, and not as other books speak. For instance, when we read in this book—"Go and do thou likewise," we know that we are listening to the voice of God. When we read: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them," we know that that is a voice from Heaven. When we read: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength, and thy neighbour as thyself," we do not quibble, we do not argue, we know that an authoritative message has come from God. We all agree that it is a unique book. There is no other book like it in all the world. There are other sacred books, but none so sacred as this one. There are other holy books, but none so holy as this. The Koran is a bible, but it is not like this Bible. Wherever it goes it blights and withers. Wherever the Bible goes, the skies brighten and the flowers begin to blossom. There is no book like this one. "Read to me from the Book," said the dying Sir Walter Scott, to his son-in-law, Lock-

hart. And Lockhart, somewhat perplexed, asked, "Which book?" Whereupon the dying man said—"There is but one." That is what we all say. The man who holds the dictation theory of Inspiration says—"There is but one!" And the man who holds the illumination theory of Inspiration also says—"There is but one!"



## II

# EVOLUTION AND THE BOOK OF GENESIS





## II

### EVOLUTION AND THE BOOK OF GENESIS \*

**B**Y Evolution I mean a theory put forward to account for the earth in its present shape, and for all existing forms of life upon it—vegetable, animal and human. The fundamental idea in evolution is the idea of development. The evolutionary hypothesis assumes that all life as we know it has come from a few simple organisms—possibly from one organism—by a process of continuous modification extending through immeasurable periods of time. Evolution is a theory of the method of creation.

The question about which we are to think is not whether evolution is true or not. That is a scientific question, and scientists must deal with it, and answer it. Vast masses of evidence must be sifted, analysed, classified and evaluated, and only a scientist can do this work. He must be an expert in anthropology and anatomy, in biology and botany, in embryology and morphology and geology and physics and paleontology and zoology, and a dozen

---

\* Preached in the Broadway Tabernacle, Sunday morning, February 10, 1924.

other sciences. Within the last sixty-five years an enormous literature has been created around this subject, and a man who would start out either to prove or disprove the theory of evolution in a single sermon could touch only lightly on the outermost fringes of the subject. Fortunately, our task is a far simpler one.

The question which concerns us is this: Is evolution anti-christian? Can a man be an evolutionist and at the same time be a Christian? Does Christianity leave it open for a man to accept the theory of evolution provided the evidence in favour of it, in his judgment, is ample? If evolution comes in at the door, must Christianity fly out through the window? Can a person believe that man has come up from the amoeba and still be a consistent follower of Jesus Christ, and a loyal member of the Christian Church? There are many people who say "No"—honest people, good people, high-minded people, noble people, devoted people, and devout people. They are convinced that evolution is anti-christian in that it is a repudiation of the Book of Genesis, and therefore of the whole Bible. They think that it is a denial of God, at least of a personal God, and a rejection of the whole spiritual interpretation of the universe. They claim that it degrades man to link him with the beasts instead of with his Maker. They assert that it explodes the doctrine of the Fall, and topples over the whole Christian scheme of redemption.

There are many people who think this. Already in two states of our nation, laws have been passed prohibiting the teaching of evolution in the public schools, and such legislation has almost been passed in several other states. It is frequently asserted that the reason why so many young men and young women become skeptics in college is because of the teaching of evolution. Forty-seven years ago the Pope declared that Darwinism was repugnant to history, to tradition, to exact science, to observed facts, and to reason itself. There are many Protestants who agree with him.

Let us begin our discussion with the Book of Genesis. It is the only Book in the Bible that deals with origins. No other Book of the Old Testament is concerned with the beginning of the world or the human race, and the only part of this Book which deals with such matters is the first three chapters. It is with the eighty verses of these three chapters, then, that we have to deal. The first question is—What is this that we are reading in these three chapters? Is it history, or is it science, or is it philosophical speculation? Is it poetry, or legend, or fable, or myth? Every man must find out for himself. This is not a matter to be left to experts. The ordinary man, whoever he may be, is capable of answering the question. One might not be able, at the end of the first chapter, to give a positive answer to the question as to whether Genesis is science, or history, or myth. But when

we reach the ninth verse of the second chapter we come to a sentence which gives a clue. We are there told that in the midst of the garden there was "the tree of knowledge of good and evil." No one has ever seen that kind of tree in an orchard, nor has any one found such a tree in the woods. All parts of the world have been visited and studied, and on no continent or island has such a tree as that been found. That sentence sounds like a story. When we come to the twenty-first verse, we are arrested again by a sentence that throws light upon our question. "And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs and closed up the flesh instead thereof: and the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man." That sounds very much like a story; women are not made that way now, nor is it at all likely that any woman was ever made that way. We are probably reading a story. When we come to the beginning of the third chapter we are absolutely convinced that it is a story, for we read of a woman and a snake holding an animated and serious conversation on a spiritual subject. This is conclusive proof that we are not reading either science or history, we are reading a story. How do we know that? What right have we to say so positively that this is a story? How do you know when you open Æsop's fables and hear the animals talking to one another that you

are reading a story? How do you know when you open La Fontaine and hear the birds talking that you are reading a story? How do you know when you open Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress" and see Pilgrim fighting with Apollyon, that you are reading a story? Your own common sense tells you. You do not need the advice of any expert. Why should not one use his common sense when he reads the Bible? There is no doubt that the first three chapters of Genesis are a story.

It is possible that some one may be shocked or surprised by hearing a preacher say that the first chapters of the Bible are a story. But why should anyone be shocked at that? Why should not the Bible begin with a story? It is the very way in which one would expect the Bible to begin. It could not possibly begin in any better way. If it is indeed God's Book, a book intended for the education of the human race, there is every reason why it ought to begin with a story. Mothers are the ordained teachers of humanity in the earliest stages of its development, and mothers are all born story-tellers. They educate their children by the stories which they tell them. Even if a girl has no talent for telling stories, the talent comes to her when she has her first baby. She is instructed by the Holy Ghost as soon as she becomes a mother to tell stories. She feeds her baby's body with milk, and as soon as it has a mind she feeds its mind on stories. The first books she buys for it are story-

books. No woman who has not fallen into the clutches of some faddist, who does not understand children at all, would ever think of giving her little children books of history or science. A child's library is made up of story-books. Every child comes into this world with an insatiable hunger for stories. You never can tell him enough of them. He is always saying—"Tell me another one." You cannot offer him a more tempting prize than a story. Tell him to be good and you will tell him another story, and he will make a desperate effort to be good. Not only do we come into the world with a great liking for stories, but we never outgrow this juvenile hunger. We belong to a story-loving race.

All over the world men and women are hungry for stories. When you glance over the books on sale in the bookstalls at the street corners, and in railway stations, you find that nearly all of the books are novels. When you pick up a popular magazine, you find it is largely filled with stories. There *are* magazines which do not run to stories, but they are not popular—their circulation is small. No magazine can have a circulation of a million subscribers which is not filled with stories. Even the newspapers in many parts of the country carry serial stories. One would suppose that the narration of passing events would be sufficiently fascinating and thrilling, but such is not the case. There are millions of human beings who feel that

a day is lost in which they do not read at least one chapter of a story. When you read the statistics of the public libraries of this country, you have a demonstration of the fact that we are a nation of novel readers. The New York City Public Library reports that in 1923, 5,568,646 novels were called for. That is more than twice as many as all other books, of all other kinds, put together. Sixteen times as many novels were called for as books of history. Only a few people are interested in history enough to read it. Nearly thirty-two times as many novels were asked for as books on science. We call this a scientific age, and imagine everybody is interested in science. Only a few people, comparatively, care to read scientific books. Nearly fifty times as many novels were taken out of the library as books on philosophy. Only a handful of human beings are at all interested in philosophy. The masses are interested in story-books. Why should not the Bible begin with a story?

One of the reasons why the Bible has such a grip upon the mind of the race is because it has in it so many stories. The Book of Esther is a story. So is the Book of Daniel. So is the Book of Jonah. The Book of Job is a story in verse, and the Book of the Song of Solomon is a story in metrical form. The Bible is God's Book, and because it is His Book, it has in it many fascinating stories. When you open your New Testament, you stand in the presence of the Man of men, and He is

the Supreme Story-teller of all time. What are His parables but little stories? What stories are better known than the story of "The Foolish Virgins," the story of "The Talents," the story of "The Prodigal Son," the story of "The Good Samaritan"? Matthew says that at a certain period of Jesus' life, He did not do anything at all but tell stories. Every time He opened His mouth a story came out. That period was the period in which He was popular, and made the deepest impression on the minds of the people. Why should any one, then, look askance at stories, and feel that they are not worthy of a place in the Bible?

There are different kinds of stories. Many are told for amusement or entertainment, but this Genesis-story is not that kind. This is a religious story, and is told for the purpose of teaching certain religious ideas. It is a serious story. The ideas which it sets out to teach are very few and easily caught. The first idea is that God made everything. The story begins with—"In the beginning God"—and from that sentence onward we are told that God made everything that you can see. He made the heavens and He made the earth. He made the land and He made the water. He made the grass and herbs and trees. He made the fish and birds and animals. He made man. He made everything. Nothing came by chance. Everything came out of the mind of God. Nothing happened by accident. Everything came into ex-



istence out of the heart of God. Nothing came as the result of blind force acting on senseless matter, but everything came by the will of God. "And God said, Let there be light, and there was light." No sublimer sentence has ever been written by the pen of man, and here is another one like unto it: "And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good." How vivid and graphic and unforgettable it all is. Read it once and you never can forget it. And how simple it is—a child can grasp it—a dullard can take it in—a man without any education can catch the point. Even barbarians and savages when the story is read to them are possessed of the idea that God made the heavens and the earth.

The second idea is equally simple and clear. It is the idea that man is the crown of creation. He is the lord of the world. That idea is expressed with great vividness and force. The story says that God made man in his own image. He created him after His own likeness, and He gave him dominion over all vegetable life, and over all animal life. God breathed into him His own breath, and made him a living personality. God gave man authority to give names to every other creature on the earth. Whatsoever name he gives to a fish or a bird or an animal, that is its name forever. The story says that after man was created, God created nothing further. He is the climax of the whole creative process. How vividly, and beautifully and

impressively it is all said! It can never be said better. A child catches the idea at once. So does every one. A child never forgets it. Neither can any one. It is a perfect specimen of story-telling.

The third idea is that man did wrong. He did something he knew he ought not to do. Because he did wrong, shame and sorrow came into the world. He did wrong because the thing he did was pleasant to the senses. He did what was wrong and had to pay the penalty. He disobeyed God, and the result of his disobedience was sweat and pain. The writer of the story is especially impressive on this point. He wants everybody to hate the spirit of disobedience, and so He puts that spirit into a snake—the most hated and loathsome of all creatures. He knows that every one hates a snake, and therefore He links a snake and the spirit of disobedience together. This is the story, then, with which the Bible opens. It will never be surpassed in majesty, in impressiveness, or effectiveness by any story-teller to the end of time. It is the greatest religious story ever written.

Some one asks, "Does this story teach science?" The answer is "No." The man who wrote the story was not a scientist. He did not know anything about science as we understand that word today. The age of science had not yet arrived. His countrymen were ignorant of science, and so was he. He was not interested in science, and

therefore he did not set himself up to teach it. He did not possess the scientific mind. He was not interested in structure as the scientific mind always is, or in processes, or in methods, or in sequences, or in chronology. All these things were entirely outside the circle of his concern. He was a religious teacher, and his scientific ideas have no weight whatsoever.

How do we know that he ignored all science, or that he did not care for it? Every one can find that out for himself. At the very beginning of the story we are told that "God made the firmament and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament." The early Jews believed that the sky is solid, and that there is an ocean above it, and that is what this writer of the Book of Genesis believed. This is what he says—"God separated the ocean above from the ocean below by means of a firmament," but this is not one of the ideas which he is attempting to teach. He is not interested in the structure of the universe. His only concern is making it clear that the universe, no matter what its structure may be, is the creation of God. He accepted the popular view of the firmament as holding above it an ocean, but that is no part of his message. A little later he says that the grass and herbs and trees were made on the third day, and that the sun and moon were made on the fourth day. That would be a strange

thing for a scientist to say. How could a tree grow without the sun? This man, however, is not a scientist, and cares nothing for science. It matters nothing to him whether the trees were made first, or the sun and the moon. God made them, no matter when they were made. The idea which he makes emphatic is not the sequence of the creative acts, but the fact that everything was created by God.

Later on, he tells us that everything was created in six days. There, again, he is stating something that science cannot accept, but this is not a part of his teaching. This man is not interested in the clock. He cares nothing for chronology. It makes no difference to him how long it took God to make the world and everything in it. His only concern is that God was the Creator, and that the universe was not all made at once. There were stages in the creation, first inorganic life, then vegetable life, then animal life and then human life, and all the stages were carried forward by God. A preacher can say "firstly," and "secondly," and "thirdly," and "fourthly," but a story-teller cannot do that. A story-teller must be picturesque. He must put things in a way which will catch and hold and delight the mind. And so this story-teller says that one day God made the sun and moon. Another day He made the grass and herbs and trees. Another day He made the fish and the birds. Another day He made the animals and man. There were six

different kinds of things which he wished to embrace in his story of creation, and therefore he put them all in six days. But his object is not to teach science, but religion. He cares nothing whatever for the facts and details of physical creation; his ambition is to make clear great truths about God and man.

It is not necessary, therefore, for us to reconcile science and the Book of Genesis. It has often been attempted, but it is a foolish thing to try to do. You can never reconcile science and the Book of Genesis without twisting language out of its shape, and cramming into words meanings which they never had. You cannot be honest with human speech and reconcile Genesis and science. -- It is a futile thing to attempt to do, and, moreover, it is a mischievous thing. When you try to reconcile science and Genesis, you give the impression that science and religion are opposed to each other, and that is not true. Muddle-headed scientists and muddle-headed theologians have often fought one another, but there is no hostility between science and religion. How could there be? They move in different spheres. Science is concerned with structure, with processes, and sequences, and what does religion care about these? Religion accepts these as rapidly as science finds out what they are. But if you try to reconcile the Book of Genesis with the latest science, and it turns out that the Book of Genesis is mistaken in regard to structure

and to sequence, then many people draw the inference that religion has been worsted. The science in the Book of Genesis is absolutely worthless, and it is a waste of time to try to do anything with it with the hope of bringing it into harmony with the science of our day.

Right here we are confronted by another question: Can a man be an authoritative teacher and make mistakes in his scientific thinking? Can he be a reliable teacher in the realm of religion and be ignorant of science? Of course he can. It is not necessary for a religious teacher to be an expert in scientific knowledge. A religious teacher makes use of the scientific knowledge of his generation. That is what the writer of the Book of Genesis did. He simply used the scientific knowledge of his time as a vehicle for the presentation of great religious truths which he wished to teach. St. Paul was one of the greatest religious teachers the world has ever known. His insight into spiritual life was amazing, but what did he know of science? He knew absolutely nothing of astronomy, of biology, of chemistry, of physiology, or medicine. There is not a boy twelve years of age who does not know more of science than Paul knew at the end of his life. Paul was an ignoramus in the realm of science, but one of the mightiest of all religious teachers.

Can a man be an authoritative teacher of religion and still be ignorant of history? Of course he can.

Shakespeare was one of the greatest teachers of the human heart that the human race has yet produced, but what did he know of history? He had only a smattering of it. He knew nothing of it as compared with Grote, Gibbon, Freeman or Froude. Moreover, Shakespeare cared nothing for history. It did not matter to him when or where an event occurred. His plays are filled with historical blunders. But who cares for that? Shakespeare was interested in something far more important than the sequence of events or the geography of the earth. He was interested in the human heart—in its aspirations and despairs—its raptures and agonies of remorse. He understood its appetites and passions. He was an expert in the ideals and movements of the soul. He knew very little history, but that does not discredit him as one of the greatest masters of the secrets of the human heart.

And, therefore, while the man who wrote the story of creation knew nothing of science, he was a matchless teacher of religion. If any of you should ask me do I believe this story, my answer is, "Of course I do." If you should ask me if it is true, I should reply, "It certainly is." If you should ask me if it is reliable, my answer would be "Yes." If you should say, "Is it authoritative," my answer would be "Yes." If you should say, "Is it inspired?" I should say, "If any story in the world was ever inspired, then this one

surely is." Its science is mistaken, its history is of no account, but in the realm of religion it is incomparable and final.

Let us compare the three great religious ideas of the writer of the Book of Genesis with the ideas put forth by the doctrine of evolution. In the Book of Genesis a constantly recurring phrase is—“God said,” “God said,” “God said.” He said, and the thing which He said was done. Nothing whatever is said about the method by which the thing was done. No attention is paid to processes. All of that is left open. We can fill in the gaps as best we may. The evolutionist comes and offers to fill in the gaps. He says that the thing was done by a process of development. Things came to be what they are by a long process of unfolding. There is no contradiction between Genesis and evolution. At this point the doctrine of evolution supplies something which the Book of Genesis omits. Some persons feel that evolution is atheistic, but in thinking this they are mistaken. To be sure, a man may be an atheist and hold the doctrine of evolution, but he is not an atheist because of the doctrine. Henry Drummond was not an atheist, but he was a confirmed believer in evolution. There are many atheists who are evolutionists, and many evolutionists believe in God—a personal God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. The doctrine of evolution does not render God unnecessary. If you want to account for the process of evolution, then you



must fall back on God. It is not enough to say the universe evolved. I want to know why it evolved—what made it evolve? The only answer which satisfies my mind is God. It is not enough to say, "The universe climbs." I want to know why it climbs—what makes it climb? The only answer, I think, is God. Why did man come out of this process? He could not have come out of it had he not been in it; and he could not have been in it unless somebody put him in it. Who put him in it? Who could have put him in it but God?

According to the doctrine of evolution God creates gradually, and not instantaneously, and in this, science would seem to be correct. How does God create a rose? He is able to create it instantaneously, but He does not do it. It takes several weeks to make a rose, even after the bud is created. Did you ever sit down in the presence of a rosebud and watch God in the process of creating a rose? If you ever did, you did not see anything happen. You watched it, it may be, for fifteen minutes, and at the end of the fifteen minutes it was still a bud. You waited a half-hour, and still it was not a rose. You waited an hour, and it continued as it was. You went back the next morning and you possibly detected a slight change. A day later you came again, and the change was more marked. Day after day you watched it, and in the fullness of time the rose was full-blown.

How did the rose come to be? It is possible to

say that God mixed up some material elements and a few forces and set them to work, and then allowed the living forces and elements to work as they could. That explanation does not satisfy me. I like to think of God being present in the rose. He is not far off. He is there. It is He Who is making the colours, and bringing the colours out. It is He Who is weaving the pattern—that exquisite pattern surpassing the patterns of all earthly artistries. It is He Who cuts the shape of the sepals and petals. It is He Who determines the perfume and texture of the flower. God creates a rose, and He creates it gradually by the process of evolution. It may be that the whole universe is a rose, and that it is unfolded by a process extending through periods of immeasurable time. The Book of Genesis allows you to believe that.

The Book of Genesis says that man is the crown of creation, he is the lord of the world—and that the universe has not produced anything higher. And this is just what evolution declares. Evolution and the Book of Genesis are beautifully at one, when it comes to putting the crown on man's head. According to Genesis, man was made in the image of God. God breathed into him the breath of life, so that he was different from all other creatures. God gave him dominion over all creatures. According to evolution, man is the climax of creation. The movement of life was always upward and toward him. The lower forms of life were antici-

patory of him—they pointed the way to him. When he appeared, the highest form of life which we know had arrived, and beyond him we do not know anything nobler or mightier. This is the teaching of evolution. It is likewise the teaching of Jesus.

According to the Book of Genesis, man is a fallen creature. And according to the doctrine of evolution, man is an ascending creature. But the two things are not contradictory. The Book of Genesis does not state that man started perfect. We have read altogether too much into the Old Testament text. All that is claimed in the Book of Genesis is that man started innocent. He was free from the sense of guilt. His conscience did not torture him. Genesis says that he started in the woods, and was naked as the animals were. The Book of Genesis says that the time came when he did what he knew to be wrong, and because he chose the worse when he might have chosen the better, and decided to take the lower when he might have taken the higher, he brought sorrow and misery into the world. And there is nothing in that which is contradicted by science. We are members of a fallen race. We have fallen short of the ideal. We do not come up to what we know we ought to be. I know I am a fallen creature, and so also do you. Every man knows that we have fallen from the place which we might have held.

Evolutionary science has written no more awe-

inspiring chapter than the chapter which it has written on "degeneration." There is a development up—but there is also a development down. It is possible to lose one's footing and fall. Science tells us of the tragedy of the evolutionary process—species have fallen, and genera have fallen, and whole races of men have fallen to a lower state than the one which they formerly held. Some species and genera and races have dropped out of existence altogether. Science assures us that it is possible to be lost. There is nothing in evolutionary science then to contradict the idea of the fall, or to do away with the need of redemption.

Why is evolution so repulsive to many Christian men? It is because they cannot help feeling that it degrades man by linking him with the animal creation. Many persons do not know any more about the doctrine of evolution than that it teaches that we are descended from monkeys. A distinguished professor in a college one day asked his class of thirty students to write down a definition of "evolution," and twelve out of the thirty wrote down this: "Evolution teaches that men came from monkeys." In a discussion of the evolutionary hypothesis, somebody is, of course, sure to bring in the word "monkey." But all such talk is cheap and thin. It throws no light whatsoever on the subject. What difference does it make whether God made man in an instant, or whether He spent a million years in his creation, so far as man's dig-

nity is concerned? In both cases he could be the son of God. The evolutionary hypothesis has been obliged to fight against human prejudice, as the Copernican theory of astronomy was obliged to fight. Men would not accept it because it disparaged man. For centuries men had believed the earth to be the centre of the universe, and that the sun, moon and stars revolved around it. This gave man great dignity and glory. When Copernicus took the earth out of the central place, and put it in an obscure corner, he thereby knocked the crown from man's head. That is what the people of the sixteenth century thought. What would they have thought if they had known the full truth? For after Copernicus, a farther-sighted astronomer came, who took our sun out of the central place and put it in an obscure corner, substituting a still larger sun, in comparison with which our sun is only a tallow dip. And within the last few years new depths of space have been explored, and new nebulae have been brought to the eye, in comparison with which our whole solar system is but a speck of dust in the ether.

But what has all this to do with the dignity of man? The earth has shrunk. Man is greater than ever. The universe is big, but man is great. And today, as in the sixteenth century, we can still say:

“What a piece of work is a man! How noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving,

how express and admirable! in action, how like an angel! in apprehension, how like a god! the beauty of the world! the paragon of animals!"

There are those who believe that you increase the dignity and majesty of man by considering him the climax of an immeasurable evolutionary process. What of the upward movement of life? Look down the illimitable vista of time and see the long climb—the heroic climb—life struggling, mounting, conquering, pushing up—that mysterious unaccountable "*élan vital*," of which Bergson speaks so much. See life climbing, unfolding, becoming more and more mysterious, powerful, beautiful, glorious, and you can repeat with a new meaning the words of a poet of long ago—"For thou hast made him but a little lower than God, and crownest him with glory and honour."

Does evolution do away with the need of a Redeemer? No. According to the doctrine of evolution, we are free to think of Christ, the Son of God, coming down to meet a baffled but ascending race. Man, because of his sin, has lost his way, but the Good Shepherd comes to find him. Man, by his transgression, has become sick in body and in mind, but the Great Physician comes to heal him. Man, by his violation of law, has become bewildered, and the Supreme Teacher comes to teach him. Man, because of his remorse, is heavy laden, but the Great Burden-Bearer comes to give him rest. Man,

because of his wandering from God, has become the victim of forces which he cannot overcome. He is met in his impotency and despair by the all-sufficient Saviour. No scientific theory will ever be able to extinguish the music of the words: "Come unto me, . . . and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out."





### III

## THE VIRGIN BIRTH



### III

#### THE VIRGIN BIRTH \*

**T**HE doctrine of the Virgin Birth has been taught by the Christian Church through nineteen hundred years. It has lived through innumerable fiery controversies, and has survived all the great divisions of the Church. It was in the eleventh century that the Christian Church split in two, and there was an Eastern Church and a Western Church, a Greek Church and a Latin Church. But both the Eastern Church and the Western Church clung to the belief in the Virgin Birth. In the sixteenth century the Western Church split in two. After that there was a Catholic Church and a Protestant Church, but both the Catholic Church and the Protestant Church confessed its belief in the Virgin Birth. Leo X and Martin Luther alike repeated the words—"conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary." A little later the Protestant Church split into three divisions—the Lutheran Church, the Reformed Church, and the Anglican Church, but all three divisions confessed belief in the doctrine

---

\* Preached in the Broadway Tabernacle, Sunday morning, February 17, 1924.

of the Virgin Birth. Soon afterward the Anglican Church split in two—the Established Church and the Nonconformist Churches. But the Established Church and the Nonconformist Churches all retained their belief in the Virgin Birth. In the course of time the Nonconformists organized themselves in four great branches—the Baptist, the Congregational, the Presbyterian, and, later on, the Methodist; but all the four great branches of the Nonconformist world confessed belief in the Virgin Birth. In America, Protestantism is split into more than a hundred branches, but with a few minor exceptions all the branches of the American Church confess belief in the Virgin Birth. That is an impressive fact—that the Virgin Birth has been a doctrine of the Christian Church in every land and in every time.

It is a doctrine which the Church has taught openly and boldly. It is taught in the Bible, and is taught in all the great creeds, both ancient and modern. The two great ancient creeds are the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed. What we call the Nicene Creed is the Creed of Nicea enlarged by the Council of Constantinople, and promulgated by the Council of Chalcedon. Both of these creeds affirm the Virgin Birth. The great modern confessions are the Augsburg Confession, the Westminster Confession, and the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Church. All these three affirm the Virgin Birth. The greatest hymn of the

Christian Church is the "Te Deum" attributed to St. Ambrose of the fourth century. This is the creed of the Church set to music, and in the "Te Deum" the Virgin Birth is affirmed. Thus the doctrine of the Virgin Birth has not only commended itself to the mind of the Church, but has been built up in its very heart. There is no disputing the fact that the overwhelming majority of all the people who have ever confessed Jesus Christ as Lord, have believed in His miraculous birth.

The day has now arrived when the ancient doctrine is doubted. In some quarters it is positively denied. This is nothing new. It has always been questioned by some, and it has always been rejected by others. In the second century the Ebonites and the Gnostics rejected it, looking upon it as a fanciful embellishment. It was discarded by the Deists of the seventeenth century as an invention, and by the sceptics of the eighteenth century as a piece of fiction, and by the Rationalists of the nineteenth century as a legend—a myth. There have never been lacking men to criticize it and condemn it. But what makes the present situation a new one is the fact that now the doctrine is questioned not by the outsiders, but by men who are inside—not by sceptics and infidels, but by the confessed followers of Jesus. There are laymen of high standing, and clergymen of great distinction, and professors of undoubted piety and wide influence who have become agnostics on the doctrine of the Virgin

Birth, and some of them reject it. That is what makes the present situation serious. Here is a sacred tradition which is called in question not by infidels, but by believers. Here is a hallowed doctrine accepted for many generations, which is doubted not by the enemies of Christianity, but by the faithful. Here is a dogma, accepted in all the great branches of the Church, which is tossed aside not by sceptics, but by the orthodox. The result is a widespread disturbance of mind. In some quarters the disturbance is actual distress—in multitudes of minds there is lamentable confusion, honest seekers after truth not knowing what to think.

The situation brings the leaders of the Church face to face with some embarrassing questions. Young men preparing for the ministry present themselves to the examining boards of the various denominations, and candidly confess that they are agnostics in regard to the Virgin Birth. What shall these examining boards do? Shall they allow young men to come into our pulpits who are agnostics in regard to this doctrine, or ought these young men to be kept out? Young men and young women are presenting themselves to our Foreign Missionary Boards, asking for commissions to work for Christ in distant lands. Some of them are not able to say that they believe in the Virgin Birth. Shall they be sent out, or must they stay at home? There are ministers in not a few pulpits who are agnostics in regard to the Virgin Birth.

And there are many laymen in every denomination who do not accept that doctrine, and what are we going to do with them? Shall we drive them out, or shall we allow them to stay where they are? These are the practical questions with which Churches have, in our day, to deal.

The situation is far more serious for some branches of the Church than for others. The Presbyterian Church, for instance, finds itself in an embarrassing situation. A man entering the ministry of the Presbyterian Church is required to accept the Westminster Confession, and in the Westminster Confession the doctrine of the Virgin Birth is clearly affirmed. The question which is now being discussed in the Presbyterian denominations is—"Can a man consistently accept the Westminster Confession who is in doubt as to the Virgin Birth?" Presbyterians are divided on that point. Some say "Yes," and others say "No."

The situation is even more serious in the Episcopal Church, for the reason that either the Apostles' Creed or the Nicene Creed must be repeated at every service, and in the recitation of the Creed, the rector leads the people. The question in the Episcopal Church is—"Can a minister consistently repeat either of those creeds in public worship when he himself is an agnostic concerning the Virgin Birth, or has definitely rejected it?" Sixty-five Bishops of the Episcopal Church have recently declared that, "To deny or treat as immaterial belief

in the creed is to trifle with words, and cannot but expose us to the suspicion and danger of dishonesty and unreality." It was that word "dishonesty" which stirred the distinguished Rector of one of our leading Episcopal Churches in New York to such a pitch of indignation, that he immediately went into his pulpit and challenged his Bishop to bring him to trial. There are Episcopal clergymen who repeat the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, and who do not accept the Virgin Birth, and they repudiate with wrath the insinuation that they are "dishonest" men.

The question is not such a serious one for Congregationalists, as they have no denominational creed binding on all the churches. Each Congregational church phrases its creed after its own will, and when a Congregational church adopts a creed, it is not used as a test but simply as testimony. Subscription to it is never made a condition of church membership. The creed now generally used in Congregational churches is known as the "Kansas City" creed, and in that creed no reference whatever is made to the Virgin Birth. In a few Congregational churches the Apostles' Creed is recited, but whenever it is so used, it is openly declared and generally understood that every individual member of the Church has a right to place upon each phrase of the Creed, the interpretation which, in his judgment, is according to the truth. Congregationalists thus carry the Protestant idea



to its logical conclusion. A fundamental idea of Protestantism is that the Scriptures contain everything necessary for salvation, and that every man has the right to interpret the Bible for himself. If every Christian has the right to interpret the Bible for himself, every Christian, so Congregationalists think, must have the right to interpret the Creed for himself. It is unthinkable that a creed should be placed above the Scriptures.

But it is not simply its form of government which saves the Congregationalists from disturbance at the present time, for the Baptists have the same form of government, and they are in great tribulation. Some of their most vehement leaders are so convinced that the doctrine of the Virgin Birth is a cardinal and essential feature of Christianity, that they are not willing to concede that a preacher has any right to preach in a Baptist pulpit, who cannot subscribe to it. Some of them declare that those who believe in the Virgin Birth must separate themselves from the others, conducting their own theological seminaries, and having their own missionary organisations. They are willing that the Baptist denomination should be split in two over the question of the Virgin Birth. This, then, is the situation which the Church in our generation faces.

The purpose here is to explain just why this question is now at the front. I want to point out as clearly as I can the forces which have been

operating to precipitate the present discussion. First of all, we should remember that it has been at the front a long time—at least a third of a century. Some of us never noticed it until yesterday, or the day before, but that is because we have not been in touch with theological discussion. It was in the year 1892, thirty-two years ago, that a young Lutheran pastor in Germany was deposed from his pulpit because he refused to repeat the Apostles' Creed, and the reason he would not repeat the Apostles' Creed was because he did not believe in the Virgin Birth. That precipitated a great discussion which raged with fierce fury over all Germany. An enormous literature was created in a few years on the subject, and in the discussion in Germany nearly everything was said on both sides which it will ever be possible to say. The things which are being said now are not new. They have been said before a thousand times. The conflagration which started in Germany leaped the English Channel and ran all over England. Men in English pulpits began to discuss the Virgin Birth, and several men of great prominence rejected it. Men like Dr. Reginald J. Campbell, then minister of the London City Temple, did not hesitate to speak after this fashion: "The credibility and significance of Christianity are in no way affected by the doctrine of the Virgin Birth otherwise than that the belief tends to put a barrier between Jesus and the race, and to make Him something which can-

not properly be called human. Like many others, I used to take the position that acceptance or non-acceptance of the doctrine of the Virgin Birth was immaterial, because Christianity was quite independent of it. But later reflection has convinced me that in point of fact it operates as a hindrance to spiritual religion, and a real living faith in Jesus."

In 1907, Dr. James Orr, a distinguished theologian of Glasgow, came over to this country and delivered a course of eight lectures in the Chapel of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York, on the Virgin Birth of Christ. With great learning and skill he presented the argument for the Virgin Birth, and to his argument little has been added since. Through the last seventeen years the question has been under discussion in circles throughout this country which are interested in theological questions, and, therefore, the present discussion is not at all new. The only new feature of the situation is that the question has now got into the street. For a long time it was confined to theological circles, but, today, men are talking about it on the street-corners. For many years the discussion was confined to the pages of theological journals, but now it has made its way into the newspapers. For a long time it was quietly talked about in the parlour and in the study, but, now, it is being broadcast, and millions are listening in.

It should also be noted that the discussion is not confined to any one country. There is disturbance

in the Lutheran Church, and in the Anglican Church, and in the Nonconformist Churches of England. In this country there is disturbance in the Presbyterian Church, in the Episcopal Church, and in the Baptist Church, and more or less commotion in several other denominations. If some one remarks that there is no disturbance whatever in the Roman Catholic Church, it should be borne in mind that there is no outward disturbance there because of the way in which the Roman Catholic Church is able to suppress public discussion. Modernism is not confined to the Protestant Churches. A third of a century ago it broke out in different Roman Catholic countries and excited widespread attention. Roman Catholic scholars were thinking and studying, and wherever men in any part of the world think and study, these questions with which modernism is dealing come to the front. In the Roman Church modernism first broke out in France, then in Germany, then in England, and then in Italy. The Roman Catholic modernists soon became so extreme that the Pope was alarmed, and in the month of July, 1907, Pius X issued a syllabus, in which modernism was condemned. The syllabus, not having the desired effect, was followed in the month of September of the same year by an encyclical, in which modernism was condemned in the most drastic terms. Even then the Pope was not satisfied, and in the year 1910, the Roman Catholic clergy were compelled

to take an oath, in which every man swore that he adhered with his whole soul to the condemnation of the syllabus and the encyclical.

That is why everything is so outwardly tranquil in the Roman Catholic Church. After the Vatican has spoken no Roman Catholic priest dares to speak in contradiction. Whatever is said in public must be said in support of what the Pope has declared. A prominent Jesuit writing in one of the Roman Catholic weeklies of this country a short while ago used language like this: "How do we know that this particular miracle of the Virgin Birth happened? We know that it happened because the Catholic Church teaches that it happened. This is, in itself, complete, absolute and final proof of the truth of this doctrine." That is interesting to us as showing the way in which the Roman Catholic mind works. In the Roman Catholic Church everything is outwardly quiet. But do not imagine that modernism has ceased to work there. The Vatican can suppress public discussion, but not private discussion. It can put an end to freedom of public teaching, but it cannot put an end to freedom of thought. The scholars of the Roman Catholic Church will continue to do what they have always done—they will think for themselves.

The question of the Virgin Birth did not come to the front by accident or chance, nor was it forced upon us by the War. We have saddled almost everything upon the War, but this is one thing for

which the War is not responsible. The question was at the front long before the War began. Let us now look at some of the forces which made this whole discussion inevitable. It is nobody's fault that it is here, it could not possibly have been escaped.

The first force that pushed it upon the world's attention was the scientific study of the Bible. By the scientific study of the Bible I mean a method of Bible study which differs from the devotional method. When we read the Bible devotionally we read it for our edification. We feed the mind by meditating on its ideas. We feed our heart by giving ourselves up to its ideals. That is a good way to study the Bible. That is the only way in which most of us have ever studied it. That will always be a helpful way to study it. But there is another form of study which is also good, and that is the scientific way. We can in the study of the Scriptures do what the scientists always do—we can pay particular attention to the form. We can separate the prose from the poetry. We can say—this is legislation, this is homily, this is folklore, this is history. After we have made these distinctions, we read different parts of the Bible in different ways. We do not read the poetry of the Bible as we read the prose. We do not read Tennyson as we read Charles Lamb. We do not read Charles Lamb as we read Blackstone. The scientific study of the Bible is sometimes called the “literary”

method. Many persons are now reading the Bible as literature, paying particular attention to the literary forms in which the Hebrew mind found expression. When we study the Bible scientifically, we study it analytically, and endeavour to find out its constituent elements. We become interested in its structure. We want to know first what it is, and how it came to be what it is. It was once supposed that the Pentateuch was written by one man, and that that man was Moses. But the scientific study of the Bible has revealed that the Pentateuch was not written by one man at any one time. It was written at different times, and by several men. It was once supposed that nearly all the Psalms were written by David, but the scientific study of the Psalm Book has shown us that there are five Psalm Books bound up in that one Book, and that those Books have been edited and re-edited many times, and that only a few of the Psalms were written by David. It was once supposed that one man wrote the whole Book of Isaiah, but the scientific study of the Book has convinced everybody that the man who wrote the first chapters did not write the last chapters.

This work of Biblical analysis has brought many interesting things to our attention. For some of us it has made the Bible a new Book. When one studies the Bible scientifically, he studies it without fear of the consequences. When a scientist carries on his investigations, the only thing with which he

is concerned are the facts. It never occurs to him to ask: "Is it safe for me to discover a fact?" And when he has found a fact he does not say: "Would it be safe for me to announce it?" He announces it as soon as he gets hold of it. He never says: "What effect is this fact going to have upon a theory which has been long held?" If a fact punctures a theory, so much the worse for the theory. A scientist wants the facts first, and then he will construct a theory which will fit the facts. A scientist never says to himself: "I must be careful in what I discover, for somebody's feelings may be hurt." If people are hurt by the discovery of a fact, then they will have to get over it. A scientist pursues his investigations without fear. For a hundred years the Bible has been studied without fear. Groups of scholars in all countries have been indefatigable in their industry, and they have found several facts which have a bearing on the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. Here they are:

There is no reference in the Old Testament to the Virgin Birth. It was once supposed that there is. Such a reference was found in Isaiah 7:14—"Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." It was assumed that that referred to the Virgin Mary, and that the boy, whose name was Immanuel, was Jesus. The study of the Bible has convinced us that there is no reference at all in that verse either



to Jesus or His mother. The Hebrew word translated "virgin" was not properly translated. That word does not mean "virgin." In other parts of the Old Testament where the word occurs, it is translated "maiden" or "damsel." When the Old Testament was translated into Greek, unfortunately, a Greek word was chosen meaning "virgin," and that is the reason why the word "virgin" occurs in the Gospel according to St. Matthew. The Hebrew word means "marriageable woman," that is, a woman that is old enough to be married, and there is no reference in the word to virginity. The prophet says that a marriageable woman shall conceive and bear a son, and that when the baby is born, his mother will call him Immanuel, which means "God is with us." In order to understand why she will give Him that name, we must have a background of history:

Let me give it to you as briefly as I can: Ahaz is king of Judah, and he is being frightened by two other kings—the king of Samaria and the king of Syria. Ahaz is much frightened, as he has a right to be, for he is no match for these two hostile kings. He decides to throw himself on the protection of Assyria. He will make an alliance with the king of that great Empire, and thus save himself and his country from the destruction threatened by the attack of the kings of Syria and Samaria. Isaiah believes that this policy is wrong. It will only end, at last, in the destruction of Judah.

He urges King Ahaz to make no such alliance, but the king will not listen to him. He begs the king to ask for a sign, in order that he may be convinced that Isaiah is speaking the truth. The king says—"I do not want any sign." Whereupon the prophet says, "God will give you a sign, and this is what it will be: A woman who is not married today will marry and have a boy, and when that boy is born, she will call his name Immanuel. She will give him a name which symbolizes the great deliverance that God has given to Judah." In other words, the king of Samaria and the king of Syria will be "down and out." The land will have been freed from the danger of overthrow at the hands of those two foes. And then the prophet goes on to say, "But when that boy is old enough to tell the difference between right and wrong (that is when he is five or six years of age) he will be living on butter and honey."

What does he mean by that? In order to understand what he means, you must read the remainder of the chapter. Isaiah goes on to tell what he means—Judah is going to be destroyed, and that, too, in a few years. God is going to shave Judah, and He will use Assyria as a razor. He will shave off the hair of the head, and the beard of the face, and even the hair of the feet. A man will have nothing left but a cow, and perhaps two sheep, and out of the milk of the cow, he will make a little butter, and from the thickets or the rocks

he will gather a little wild honey, and that will be all that the people will have to eat. There will be no meat to eat, and there will be no fruit to eat, for the trees will have been cut down, and the vines will have been trampled. In a very few years all this is going to happen, and that will be proof that Isaiah has spoken the will of God.

Any one can see that the prophet is not thinking about a Virgin Birth, nor is he making any reference to Jesus of Nazareth. If he were thinking of Jesus of Nazareth the prophet was entirely mistaken, for Jesus of Nazareth was not born until seven hundred years after Isaiah spoke, and how then could Jesus be a sign to Ahaz? The prophet said—"God is going to give you a sign, and he will give it to you very soon. Those kings of whom you are so afraid will be overthrown in less than a year, and in less than six years your own country will go down, because you have trusted in Assyria." I shall never forget the sensation which came over me when my Hebrew professor gave me that explanation years ago. It seemed as though a part of the crust of the earth had caved in. There is no doubt, however, that that interpretation is correct.

There is no reference to a Virgin Birth anywhere in the Old Testament, nor is there any such reference in any Jewish literature outside of the Old Testament Canon. The Apocryphal writings and the Apocalyptic writings have been searched

diligently, and no reference to a Virgin Birth has ever been found. The Jews never expected their Messiah to be born of a Virgin. That is one of the facts with which we must reckon. When we turn to the New Testament, we begin with the Gospel of Mark. Modern scholarship has proved that that is the oldest of the four Gospels. We call it the "Gospel of Mark," but it is the Gospel of Peter. Mark was Peter's amanuensis. Papias, a bishop who lived at the beginning of the second century, says that "Mark wrote down what he remembered," and Irenæus, a bishop who lived at the end of the second century, says that "Mark wrote down what Peter preached." In the second Gospel, then, we have the preaching of Peter, but the Virgin Birth was no part of the preaching of the first great Christian preacher. Mark wrote down what Peter considered the Gospel message. He wrote down what Peter called "the good news," and the Virgin Birth was not a part of the good news. That is the second fact to be remembered.

In the Fourth Gospel, there is no reference to the Virgin Birth. That is surprising because the Fourth Gospel is pre-eminently the Gospel of the Incarnation. That is the Gospel which begins—"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." In that Gospel we are told that the Word was made flesh. But in the Gospel of the Incarnation, there is no

reference to the Virgin Birth. That is a third fact which has impressed many.

When you read the Book of the Acts, the first volume of Church history, you will find several samples of apostolic preaching. There are sermons of Peter and sermons of Paul, and a sermon by the deacon Stephen, but in none is there any reference to the Virgin Birth. When you read the Epistles of Peter, you find no reference to the miraculous birth of Jesus, nor will you find any such reference to it in any of the thirteen Letters of Paul. Paul had a high conception of the person of Jesus. He believed that Christ existed before He became incarnate. In his Letter to the Philippians he declares that "Christ existed in the form of God," but in none of his Letters is there the slightest reference to the Virgin Birth. Paul does not seem to be interested in Jesus' birth. That fact has made its impression on many. In the Letter to the Hebrews, we find a writer who has a most exalted idea of the person of Jesus. He places Him far above all men and all angels, but he says nothing of the Virgin Birth.

The Virgin Birth is not mentioned in any Books of the New Testament except in the Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of Luke. Neither one is written by an Apostle. The Apostle Matthew, according to tradition, wrote down some of the sayings of Jesus, and his little book was known as the "Logia." It is believed that the "Logia" is to be

found in this first Gospel, but the Book itself is a compilation, for nearly all of the Gospel of Mark is in the First Gospel, along with the "Logia," and possibly several other documents. Who wrote the first two chapters of the First Gospel, nobody knows—nobody will ever know. The Third Gospel was written by a Gentile of Antioch, who came down into Palestine, just when, we do not know, to get material for a book which he wanted to write for an intimate friend of his. He gathered together the things which he found the Christians of Palestine believed. These are the only two Books of the twenty-seven Books of the New Testament which contain the slightest reference to the Virgin Birth.

When we begin to study the opening chapters of Matthew and Luke, we find ourselves facing something exceedingly puzzling. Matthew gives us the genealogy of Jesus. He begins with Abraham, and runs right down to Joseph. Why should he run down to Joseph if Joseph were not Jesus' Father? What right has Joseph to a place in a genealogy of Jesus if Joseph had no connection with him whatever? Luke also gives us a genealogy. In it he starts with Joseph and traces Jesus' pedigree back to Adam. But why should Joseph be in the pedigree of Jesus if Joseph were not His father? Luke says that Joseph was "supposed" to be His father. But why should a suppositional father be put in the genealogy of a man? These Gospels of

Matthew and Luke constitute one of the greatest of all the New Testament puzzles. Thousands of pages have been written trying to explain them, but no satisfactory explanation has as yet been found.

Moreover: in the Gospels it is assumed, more than once, that Joseph was Jesus' father. Luke does not hesitate to say that "His parents brought Jesus into the temple," and that "His parents brought Him down to Jerusalem," and that "His parents did not know that He had tarried behind." Even Mary is represented as saying to Jesus: "Your father and I have sought you sorrowing." It looks a little as though there might have been two traditions in Palestine in the earlier years—according to one tradition, Joseph was Jesus' father, according to another tradition, God was His father. There are some who feel that these two traditions have been incorporated in our New Testament, so that if a man believes in the Virgin Birth he can find Scriptural support, and if a man does not believe in the Virgin Birth he also has Scriptural support for his unbelief. These are the facts, then, which have been making their impression on the men of our day. They affect different minds in different ways. Some minds are powerfully affected by them, and driven by them into agnosticism concerning the Virgin Birth. There are many Bible students who are not so confident of the Virgin Birth as our fathers were. They are not so sure that Joseph was not His father as preced-

ing generations have been. Such men believe that the wiser position is to remain agnostic in regard to this ancient doctrine of the Church.

The second force which has been at work is the scientific study of history. The two great fields for investigation within the last hundred years are the physical universe and human history. The whole earth has been ransacked by men who have been determined to reproduce so far as possible the past. All the libraries have been explored, the tombs have been searched, the ruins of buried cities have been dug up and studied, even the sand-heaps have been sifted, and every scrap of former days, every fragment of vanished civilisations, every tiny bit of ancient empires has been scrutinized and treasured and squeezed, that it might give up the last drop of information concerning the past. Our age has developed an historical sense superior to that of any preceding time. Three facts have emerged from this scientific study of history. First, legends are a product which are found in every soil. They grow up fast. Fancy twines itself around fact, and it does this very soon, so that it is impossible for later generations to disentangle them. Legends grow up rank around the beginnings of a religion. The beginnings of all religions are surrounded by legends, and so are the beginnings of great men. The fact that legends have grown in every land and in every time, has started the question in a good many minds: may it not be that the story of



the Virgin Birth is a legend, a beautiful fancy that took root in the Christian heart in the earlier stages of the life of the Christian Church?

A second fact which the study of Christian history has made clear, is the prevalence of stories of supernatural births. Three other religions besides Christianity claim that their founder had a supernatural birth, and one religion claims that its founder was born of a virgin. It was not at all uncommon in the ancient pagan world to say that a great man had a god for his father. Plato, and Alexander the Great, and Cæsar Augustus and others were alleged to have been begotten by some god. The fact that the human mind seems to like to account for a great man by giving him a divine father, has started the question in a good many minds—Is the story of the Virgin Birth a story similar to the story which asserts that Zoroaster was born of a virgin?

A third fact which historical study has brought into clear light is the exaltation of celibacy. In the ancient world sex was a fountain of such continuous disorder and misery that some minds concluded that in physical union there must be something essentially evil, and that if a man wished to live the holy and ideal life, he must never marry. That celibacy is higher than marriage was a tradition in the East long before Jesus was born. The early Church picked up this tradition, adopted it as its own, and celibacy became generally acknowl-

edged as a higher way of living. Even to the present hour, the Roman Catholic Church places celibacy above marriage. It does not condemn marriage. It admits that marriage is good, but it asserts that celibacy is better. It confesses that marriage is holy, but it asserts that one can reach a higher degree of holiness in the celibate life than in the married life. The Roman Catholic Church teaches the perpetual virginity of Mary. She was never married in any worldly sense. Her marriage was only nominal. She never had any child but Jesus. The men who are called the brothers of Jesus in the Gospels were not His brothers at all. They were His cousins—sons of His mother's sister. The fact that celibacy was so exalted in the earlier centuries has prompted this thought in many minds—Possibly the doctrine of the Virgin Birth is nothing but the explanation which the earlier Christians gave of the holiness of Jesus.

But there is a third force which has been at work to cause distrust of the Virgin Birth, and this third force is probably the mightiest of them all. The study of natural science has given a certain bias to the mind which makes it reluctant to accept any departure from the established order. Men who work in laboratories and follow the processes of nature are profoundly impressed by her uniformities. She always does the same thing in the same way. Her sequences and coincidences are un-

changed and unchangeable. We who have never worked in laboratories are greatly influenced by the environment in which we live. We all know more or less of the universality and unchangeableness of law, and because of this belief, it is difficult for us to believe in a miracle. Matthew Arnold spoke for a multitude of minds when he said in his lordly way—"Miracles do not happen." The miracles of the Middle Ages, for instance—we brush them all aside with a smile. The miracles of our own generation, we give little credence to. When a man tells us of a man who has been born blind getting power to see, we pity the man who tells the story. And if anyone should tell us of somebody coming out of the grave, we should reject his story with scorn. We do not readily believe in any departure from the natural order, and so the Church, today, has been obliged to rewrite its definition of a miracle. It is not a "violation" of the law of nature. There are no such violations. Nor is it a "suspension" of the law of nature. There are no such suspensions. If a miracle occurs at all, it is because of the emergence of a mightier force in the scheme of things, of whose operations we are as yet ignorant. When, therefore, Christianity comes to us saying—"Jesus was miraculously born," we are predisposed to question it. There is a mental bias against it, and some men have this bias very strong.\* It is admitted that all other human beings have come into the world in a natural way. Bil-

lions of babies have been born, all of them in the same way, but Christianity asserts that there was one exception, and only one. That was in the case of Jesus. There are some minds that will not accept that. They cannot accept it. What, then, are you going to do?

Let me give you some of the conclusions at which my own mind has arrived. First of all, the Virgin Birth need not be discarded because of anything that science has found out. There is nothing whatsoever in modern science to prevent a man believing in the Virgin Birth. It is sometimes assumed that science has disproved it. This is a mistake. How could science disprove it? Science cannot prove it, and science cannot disprove it. It lies in a realm into which science cannot go. The people who pride themselves on rejecting the Virgin Birth because they are scientific, are using language which is pretentious, and which ought to deceive no one. You may say that you are an agnostic in regard to the Virgin Birth, but that is as far as you have a right to go. If you deny it, you have no solid ground on which to stand.

In the second place, the Virgin Birth need not be discarded because of anything which historical scholarship has discovered. Nothing has been found in any of the libraries, or in any of the tombs, or in any of the sand-heaps, which compels us to give up our belief in the Virgin Birth.

It is sometimes assumed that all scholars have

given up this doctrine, and only ignoramuses and credulous people still retain it. This is not the fact. There are more scholars in the Christian Church who believe in the Virgin Birth than there are scholars on the other side. There is nothing in modern scholarship which compels a man to surrender the ancient tradition of Jesus' miraculous birth.

It is clear, I think, that belief in the Virgin Birth is not essential to salvation. If the New Testament has any authority at all, it makes that abundantly clear. Simon Peter on the day of Pentecost was confronted by a host of anxious-hearted men asking him what to do in order to be saved. He told them, but he made no reference to the Virgin Birth. St. Paul in the city of Philippi was confronted one night by a man in consternation, asking what he was to do to be saved, and in the answer which Paul gave, there was no reference to the Virgin Birth. In his Letter to the Romans, Paul says that if we confess with our mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in our heart that God raised Him from the dead, we shall be saved. That certainly settles it that belief in the Virgin Birth is not essential to salvation. A belief in the Virgin Birth is not essential—I am convinced—to Christian discipleship. We know this from a careful study of the Gospels. Jesus was always trying to make disciples—always urging men to follow Him, but never once in any of His recorded teaching did He make the slightest reference to His

birth. All he said was—"Follow me. Do the things which I say." If a man was willing to obey Him, he became His disciple. What was sufficient then must be sufficient now. Who are we that we should impose conditions which Jesus Himself never imposed?

If belief in the Virgin Birth is not essential to discipleship, then it follows it cannot be essential to church membership. It would be absurd to say that a man can follow Jesus up to the church door, but he must not follow Him any farther. He can have the spirit of Jesus, but he must not come into Jesus' church. He can have a brotherly heart, but he cannot belong to the Christian brotherhood. He can go about doing good, and act like a son of God, but he cannot belong to the Christian family. How could we logically confess that a man may be a Christian without believing in the Virgin Birth, and then deny his admittance into the organisation which is engaged in doing Jesus' work?

Belief in the Virgin Birth is not essential to belief in the Incarnation. If it were, John would not have left it out of his Gospel, and Paul would not have left it out of his Letters. It is at this point that many earnest minds are confused. To them it seems that a denial of the Virgin Birth is virtually a denial of the Incarnation. Upon this point, I should like to call your attention to the judgment of Dr. Charles Gore, the greatest living theologian in the English-speaking world. He has

always held the highest conception of the Person of Jesus. He made his reputation years ago by the publishing of his volume—"The Incarnation of the Son of God." He has always believed in the Virgin Birth, and believes in it now. But in a volume which he published two or three years ago, entitled "Belief in God," he says this: "The question of the birth is secondary and not primary; the question of faith in Jesus must rest still where it was made to rest from the beginning, on the life, teachings, death and resurrection of Jesus. On these quite apart from any questions concerning His birth the faith stood, and still could stand."

In a letter written to a gentleman living in New York, dated January 9, 1924, Dr. Gore says: "The Incarnation was believed in for, perhaps, thirty years, before the fact of the Virgin Birth was widely known through the publication of the Gospel of St. Luke."

If the early Christians believed in the Incarnation, and knew nothing about the Virgin Birth, surely it is possible for the Christians of the twentieth century to believe in the Incarnation while they are agnostics in regard to the manner of His birth. These are conclusions to which my own mind has come.

And now it is only fair that I should state my own position. As many of you know, and as I want everybody to know, I have always believed, and still believe in the Virgin Birth. My confi-

dence in the historicity of the miraculous birth of our Lord has never been shaken by anything that I have ever heard or by anything I have ever read. I have read thousands of pages on the subject, but have never yet found an argument to weaken my belief. How I arrived at my belief may be interesting to you as showing you how one mind, at least, works. I do not base my belief in the Virgin Birth on a sentence or two in Matthew, and a sentence or two in Luke. That, I think, is rather a frail foundation on which to rest so weighty a doctrine. My mind works more after the fashion of Paul's mind. He did not base his belief in the Divinity of Jesus on the manner of His birth. At the beginning of his Letter to the Romans, he says that Jesus was born "of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." In other words, Paul based his belief in the Divinity of Christ on Christ's holiness and power. And that is where I base my belief. I believe that Jesus is "the Holiest of the Mighty." The study of history has made that increasingly clear. We are now acquainted with all the saints of all ages, and no one of them is a sinless man. They have all sinned and come short of the glory of God—all save this man alone. Jesus is unique in His sinlessness. Moreover, He is the "Mightiest of the Holy." We are now acquainted with the founders of all the religions of



the earth, and not one of them is worthy to unloose the latchet of His shoes. The study of history has made me sure of that. Moreover, in the graphic phrase of Jean Paul Richter—"He lifted empires off their hinges, and turned the stream of the centuries into a new channel!" Those who know history best, know that that is true. The history of this world can be cut into two parts—ancient history ends with the death of Jesus, modern history begins there. The whole world is different because Jesus came.

When I look across the world today I do not see any spots that are very bright, but I see certain spots that are not so dark as others, and the spots that are less dark are the spots where the name of Jesus is best known. There is no hope in Buddhism. There is no hope in Confucianism. Men who see Confucianism and Buddhism face to face know that there is no hope in them. There is no hope in Zoroastrianism. Every one who has traveled in Persia knows that. There is no hope in Mohammedanism. Every one who has traveled in Turkey knows that. There is no hope in any religion except the religion of Jesus. Some one may say—"Ah! Christendom is dark, too!" So it is, but Christianity and Christendom are not coterminous. We have no right to use these terms synonymously. Christendom is a geographical term designating that area of the world in which Christianity has done its largest work. But Chris-

tendom is not Christian. There are no Christian nations. We have, however, some Christian homes, and in those Christian homes there is light. In them there is a radiance which has come, we are sure, from Heaven. In the brightest spots on the earth there is light which comes from the face of Jesus. It is only where Jesus is obeyed that the darkness has vanished and the morning has come. The darkest spots in Christendom are made dark by disobedience to Jesus.

When I turn from the outside world to my own experience, I know that when I have enjoyed a peace that passes understanding, I have been obedient to Him, and that when I have been most wretched, it has been because I have disobeyed Him. From my own experience, and from the experience of many men and women whom I know, I am sure that when one obeys Jesus he obeys God—that when he sees Jesus he sees God, when he finds Jesus he finds God. I believe, then, the story of the Virgin Birth, not through the New Testament but through my observation of the power of Jesus and my experience of it in my own heart.

I am ready to accept what Paul says about His resurrection. I believe that His resurrection was miraculous—that He went out of this world in a unique way. It is easy for me to believe that, because I have found that He, Himself, is unique. Accepting the story of His unique resurrection I am prepared to accept the story of His miraculous

birth. If He went out of the world in a miraculous manner, why should He not have come into the world in a supernatural way? And if His beginning was miraculous, and His end was miraculous, then I am willing to accept the miracles which lie between. He did things which no other man has ever done. I approach the miracles through the person of Jesus. They are credible to me because I believe that He is the Son of God. I cannot reject His miraculous deeds if I accept His miraculous words. His words are as miraculous as His deeds. "Never man spake like this man." That is what the men of His own generation said. This is what we still say—"He, alone, has the words of eternal life." "There is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." His claims are unique—He claims to be the Judge of the world. He says that He is going to send individuals and nations, some of them to their blessed reward, and some to their doom. He says this because He is the Son of God. He, Himself, is a miracle, and because He is the Eternal Son of the Everlasting Father, it is easy for me to believe in the Virgin Birth. In exultation and awe, I bow my head and repeat the words that uncounted millions have repeated: "I believe . . . in Jesus Christ, His only Son our Lord; Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, Born of the Virgin Mary."



#### IV

### THE USE OF CREEDS



## IV,

### THE USE OF CREEDS\*

SOME one promptly says—"They are of no use at all." The antipathy to creeds is one of the outstanding phenomena of our day. It exists outside the Church, which is not surprising. It also exists inside the Church, which is somewhat disconcerting. The outside world is always leaking in. In every generation the Church is coloured and modified by contemporaneous thought and feeling. Whenever the outside world shouts—"Away with the creeds," that voice is echoed from within. Sometimes the antipathy takes the form of indifference. Men do not care for creeds. They are not interested in them. They are interested in ethics and economics, in politics and social reform, but creeds do not concern them. Sometimes the antipathy takes the form of hostility. There are many people who are quite vehement in their denunciation of creeds. They feel they are stumbling-blocks to progress—sources of mischief—a sort of nuisance. Some go so far as to say they are a curse.

---

\* Preached in the Broadway Tabernacle, Sunday morning, February 24, 1924.

The argument against creeds runs oftentimes somewhat as follows: Why not organize the Church on the basis of good will? What more is necessary than that? Why not get people to come together who have a brotherly disposition—whose minds are gentle, and whose hearts are kind? Or, why not run the Church on the basis of good works? Why not build a Church made up of people who are interested in social service, and willing to give themselves to the betterment of the town? Why stir up mischief by bringing in a creed which can only divide people and cause interminable controversy? It all sounds so plausible that many people are convinced by it. It sounds axiomatic and final, but like many another argument that sounds sensible, there is nothing in it. We have no other lamp by which our feet may be guided except the lamp of experience, and experience has demonstrated that a Church without a creed cannot endure. An enduring Church cannot be built upon sentiment or upon good works. That has been tried again and again. The people who are always disparaging creeds, ought to read history. It would save them from a deal of foolish talking, and they would not be so ready to go into enterprises that are doomed to come to nothing. Or if one has not time to read history, he might at least open his eyes and see what is going on around him at the present time.

One of the mighty churches of our day is the



Roman Catholic Church. It has endured through a long number of centuries. It gives no signs of passing away. The Roman Catholic Church has four creeds, the three Ecumenical creeds: the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian, and the long creed known as "The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent," adopted in the sixteenth century, which sets forth the doctrinal positions of the Roman Church with great fullness. One of the sources of strength of the Catholic Church is the clearness with which it states its doctrinal beliefs, and the boldness with which it proclaims them in all parts of the world. Take away the creeds of the Roman Catholic Church, and it would speedily collapse.

When you turn from Roman Catholicism to Protestantism, you discover that, in our country, there are many Protestant bodies. There is quite a procession of them, and it is worth one's while to look at the procession. At the front of the procession move a number of denominations vital and mighty, and all of these large denominations are denominations with a creed. They all have a definite body of belief which they proclaim with positiveness and authority. At the end of the procession there are a number of small denominations, anæmic and ineffective, and these are the denominations which have never paid much attention to creeds, and have occasionally boasted loudly that they did not believe in a creed at all. I should

think that a man with a scientific mind would pay attention to a fact like that. My teachers always instructed me that a phenomenon which is enduring is a phenomenon worth looking into. Here is a phenomenon which has continued through a long number of centuries. A church has no chance of surviving if it does not have a creed.

This is a free country, and any group of men and women can organise a Church whenever they please. It would be easy to organise a Church without any forms of worship. Many people are convinced that the Church is handicapped by its forms of worship. They regard them as irksome and unnecessary, as retarding the Church's progress. It would be easy to organise a Church without any forms of worship. It would be easy to organise a Church without any creed. Many people feel that multitudes would flock into the Church if it were not for creedal barriers. We are often informed that the reason so many people are outside of the Church is because they are disgusted with creeds and dogmas. Well, many a Church has been organised without any creed, and with the very simplest forms of worship. Yet this surprising thing always happens: The people who want to join a Church at all will pass by the Church that has no creed, and enter the Church which has one. Those persons who are always scoffing at creeds ought to explain this singular phenomenon.

Not only is a creed essential to an enduring

Church, but it is also indispensable to a conquering Church. By a conquering Church I mean a Church that overcomes great obstacles and performs mighty works. It is easy enough to have an apparently prosperous congregation, a company of men and women interested in the philosophy of religion who listen on the Lord's Day to an interesting lecture or essay, but if you want a Church that does things that are mighty, you must have a creed. No Church is mighty that does not cleanse life at the fountain—that does not turn the stream of experience into a new channel—that does not lay its hands on the life of the community in such a way as to reshape that life and make men different from what they were. The history of nineteen hundred years proves that whenever a mighty work is to be done, it must be done by men who have been made strong by a creed.

In the fifth century there was imminent danger of the last vestiges of Roman civilisation being blotted out by the inroads of the barbarians from the North. The only force that averted the disaster was the force lodged in the men who believed in God the Father Almighty and in Jesus Christ, His only Son our Lord. In the seventh and eighth centuries Europe was threatened with an awful calamity—the hosts of Mohammedanism bursting from Arabia, started on their victorious march westward. Country after country was swept with fire and sword, and it looked at one time as though

the whole continent of Europe would cease to be Christian and become Mohammedan. It was not until A. D. 732 that, on the battlefield of Tours, the Mohammedan invasion was checked. It was checked by men who believed in God the Father Almighty and in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord. The only men who had strength enough in them to stand up against the creed which was proclaimed every day from the minarets—"There is no God but God, and Mahomet is His prophet," were the men who were able to say—"I believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ, His only Son our Lord."

And what has happened in the past is happening again in our own generation. There are mighty works to be performed, and the only Churches which attempt to do them are the Churches with a creed—a compact body of belief which they proclaim with confidence and authority. One of the great works to be done in our generation is the lifting up of the negro race. It is a belated race—belated because of the wickedness of the white race. And which are the Churches which are putting their arms underneath the black race and trying to lift it up? The creedless Churches are conspicuous for their absence in this great enterprise. There are no Churches which are earnestly striving to lift up the black race from its degradation except the Churches which have a creed.

And when it comes to subduing the mind and

heart of the non-Christian world, who are the men who go forth to this mighty task, but the men whose creed is definite and positive? The men who go to far-off places—to the centre of the continents that are dark, and to cannibal islands—are men and women whose minds have surrendered to a creed. This, then, is a fact which we cannot wisely lose sight of. In a creed we do not say “we suppose,” or “we conjecture,” or “we think,” but “we believe.” “This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. And who is he that overcometh the world, but he who believes Jesus is the Son of God?”

A creed is the creation of the intellect. It is the answer which the intellect formulates to the questions which the heart asks. In the earlier stages of religion there is no thought. It is nothing but feeling. In the lower strata of the negro race in the South there is plenty of religion, but little thought. The negroes' religion is largely emotion. As men rise in the scale of civilisation they are not content to allow religion to remain merely a matter of feeling, they convert it into a ceremony. In all the religions which existed before the coming of Jesus, there was an abundance of ritual. Men were religious in proportion as they performed certain ceremonies and rites. There was not much thought in religion but much action. But the time arrives when it is necessary for men to think if they are going to retain their religion at all. They must

answer certain questions which the heart asks. They must solve certain problems which experience presses upon the mind.

Men, as they go on in life, cannot repress certain questions that surge up in the soul—"Is there a God?" "What kind of a God is He?" Men become caught in a swirl of forces, from which they are not able to extricate themselves, and the heart asks—"Is there a Saviour?" Men are overtaken by sorrows. Their hearts are torn and bleeding, and they cry out in their distress—"Is there a Comforter?" Men become bewildered in their efforts to find the way of life, and they ask—"Is there an organisation which is entrusted with God's message? Is there a teacher who can instruct men in the way of life?" "Is there such a thing as forgiveness?" The time comes when to a man that is the supreme question. He has sinned and has become conscious of the heinousness of his sin. He wants to know if he can be forgiven. He wants somebody to tell him that. He wants somebody to tell him who can tell him with confidence. "Is there life on the other side of death?" We may postpone that question for a long time. We may say jauntily that "One world at a time is enough," but to every man who really lives, the day arrives on which that is a question of absorbing interest. "Is there life on the other side of the grave?" A creed is a series of answers to questions like these.

Before the Great War our religion, in many

quarters, had become shallow and inefficient. We were doing many things, but we were slipshod in our thinking. The intellectual side of religion was largely neglected. We had a multitude of organisations, all of them doing useful things, but we did not seriously face the great questions. As soon as the war came, we all became theological. One of the first questions that men asked was—"Is there a God?" "If there is a God, what kind of a God is He?" "Does God see?" "Does He hear?" "Does He care?" "If He cares, why does He not stop this?" We all were eager to know more about God. And when boys began to die by the thousands, then the question of life after death was forced on us again. Thousands of people began to say—"Is there life beyond death?" "Where do young men go when they 'go West'?"

I have heard it stated that in Great Britain, 12,274 new volumes were published last year, and that in this number fiction stood first, and religion second. That is a great record for religion to make. It shows what a multitude of people in Great Britain are thinking of God and the soul, and the relation of one to the other. Men are feeling after a creed. A friend of mine who recently visited Atlantic City told me how amazed he was to find a bookstore in Atlantic City stocked with religious books. Shelf after shelf was filled with them. They were piled upon the tables, and even on the floor. It had never occurred to him that

people would go to Atlantic City to study theology. We are living in a day when there is a great awakening in regard to the importance of the intellectual side of religion. We cannot live on emotion or on sentiment alone. We have got to work out answers to the questions which the heart asks.

Whenever we live deeply, we inevitably become theological. I have known many a girl who, in her early womanhood, cared nothing for the intellectual side of religion. She was religious in her own way, belonging to the Church, doing various bits of good work, but caring nothing at all for the creed. By and by she married; later on the baby came, and at the end of the first year the baby died. Then, in an instant, she became theological. She began to ask about God—"What kind of a God is there?" "Why has He done this?" A girl with her dead baby in her arms is always a theologian. First of all, she wants to know something about God. In the second place she wants to know where babies go when they die. Then, for the first time, she awakens to the value of a creed.

Let us never imagine that it is enough to say to men and women—"Come, let us get together. Let us do this, and this, and this." The Church must have a Gospel. The Church must tell people what it is possible for them to believe. A Church must have a message. It cannot live upon an exhortation. It lives only by the truth it proclaims. I wonder how many of us have ever seen the ponder-



ous volumes of Philip Schaff on "The Creeds of Christendom." To simply turn the pages, and glance hastily at the creeds of the Christian Church, as set forth therein, is to be awed in the presence of these great efforts of the human intellect to answer the questions which the heart persistently asks.

If, then, we must have a creed, the question arises—"To what use can it be put?" First of all, it can be used as a catechism. A catechism is a creed broken into questions and answers. This is a form in which a creed is made use of in the education of children or in the instruction of catechumens or candidates for church membership. The catechism prepared by Martin Luther, the Heidelberg Catechism and the Westminster Catechism are only three of the many catechisms prepared by the Church for the education of children. It is the children who have been brought up on a catechism that become the strongest and most effective workers in the Church.

A creed can also be used as a standard into which the mind is brought back for sustenance and strengthening. We are living in a world filled with mysteries, and the human intellect easily goes astray. There are innumerable pitfalls into which the mind may tumble, and there are numberless by-paths which lead nowhere. The mind is easily led astray into pantheism, or deism, or agnosticism. It may be captivated by Stoicism, or Epicureanism, or Cynicism. It may become enamored of Socin-

ianism, or Arianism, or Pelagianism. It may sink down into Buddhism or Confucianism or Theosophy. We need a standard to which the mind may be called back. The leaders of the Christian Church must have a standard if they are to rally the people to live and work for God. No man can be a great preacher who does not have a creed. It is only when he has a standard to which he can call people, that he speaks and works with power. Multitudes of minds move in a fog. Again and again they are overtaken by night. The creed is a standard which, flashing on the sight, calls men back into the paths which lead to life.

Or the creed may be used as a confession and be made a feature of public worship. This is one of the best uses to which a creed can be put. We all believe in singing together. Each one of us could sing alone, possibly, but it is much better to sing together. When we sing together our hearts touch. We pray together. Almost from the beginning, the followers of Jesus have loved to repeat the prayer which He one day gave them. Through all the Christian centuries His followers have repeated that prayer together, and when we repeat it, our spirits touch. We read the Scriptures together, especially the Psalter, and in doing this, our voices and minds touch. It is one of the most beautiful of all the features of public worship—this reading of the Scriptures together. In doing this the voices of children and parents mingle.

The voices of young men and young women on the threshold of life mingle with the voices of aged men and aged women, who are looking into the sunset.

In a great city congregation the service is especially beautiful because of the different countries and races represented in the congregation. There are Welsh voices and Scotch and Irish voices and English voices, French voices and German voices, and Scandinavian voices, all mingling together, making vocal the ideas of holy men of old. But beautiful as that is, it is not to my mind a whit more beautiful than the recitation of the creed. We do something in reciting the creed which we do in no other part of the service. There is a blessing which comes to us in reciting the creed which comes to us through no other channel. There is something intensely individual and personal in the recitation of the creed. When we are singing we are in the realm of emotion, and everything is more or less vague. It is possible for us to lose ourselves in the hymn. When we are reading the Scriptures responsively we are not dealing with our own ideas, but with the ideas of someone else. We are not necessarily making them our own. When we repeat the Lord's Prayer, we are in the realm of aspiration. But when we repeat the creed we are declaring what we, ourselves, believe. We state in definite phrases the faith that we hold. We allow the mind to come to the front. We link

ourselves with clear statements, definite affirmations, positive declarations. We may do all this in a way that is stupid and dull, but when we put our mind into it, it is wonderfully strengthening and refreshing. There is no more vitalizing and uplifting exercise in public worship than the recitation of the creed.

If a creed is used in public worship, what creed shall we use? The answer is easy. There is no creed so fitting for public worship as the Apostles' Creed. In the first place it is short. The Nicene Creed is too long for public worship, and the Athanasian Creed is still longer. The great Confessions of the seventeenth century are altogether impossible. No creed was written in the nineteenth century so suitable for public worship as is the Apostles' Creed. It has the advantage of being short, and the further advantage of being old. It is a good thing to use old things when they are good. The very age of the Creed gives it augmented power. In its present form it has been used since the middle of the eighth century. Through twelve hundred years Christians have been repeating the same words we are repeating today. But the most of the Creed was in use in the middle of the fourth century; that means that through sixteen hundred years the followers of Jesus have been saying the things which we are saying today. But the heart of the Creed can be traced back to the middle of the second century,

and we are not sure but that it can be traced back to the end of the first century. So that when we repeat the Apostles' Creed, we are saying words that have been repeated by the overwhelming majority of all the followers of our Lord through eighteen hundred years. To repeat it helps to keep alive in us the sense of the unity of the ages. We are children of the past. We belong to the past. The past belongs to us. This is something that has come down to us. We are passing it on to the future. A man or woman with the historic sense can in his mind's eye see, while he is repeating the Apostles' Creed, an innumerable company of the followers of our Lord who, in other lands and in distant times, have proclaimed the same truths to which we ourselves are now bearing witness.

This Creed also has the advantage of being a bond of union between separated groups of Christians. It is the creed of the Roman Catholic Church in all lands. It is the creed of the Lutheran Church, and of the Anglican Church, of the Episcopal Church, of the Methodist Church, and of many other branches of the Universal Church of God. When one repeats it he can, in his imagination, hear the voices of millions of Christians far away, with whom he is joining in this great act of worship. He does not belong to them outwardly. He does not bear their name, or adopt their methods, but in the recital of the

creed he and they are one. This is of special importance because of the radical differences existing between Roman Catholics and Protestants.

The Roman Catholic Church government is so different from ours that one is tempted sometimes to say—"Why, these are two religions," and the forms of worship are so different in a Catholic Church from the forms made use of in a Protestant Church, that an observer looking on would be impelled to say—"These cannot belong together." But after you pass by the forms of government and forms of worship and hear the Roman Catholics and the Protestants assert what they believe, you will find that they are saying the same thing: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth." Who says that? The Roman Catholics. That is what we say also. "We believe in Jesus Christ, His Only Son our Lord." That is what we say; but the Catholics say it also. When it comes to the things that are fundamental, the Roman Catholics and the Protestants stand side by side. The Roman Catholic Church has built many things upon the Apostles' Creed which we Protestants cannot accept, but when we come down to the things that are essential, we find that we are both building upon the one foundation. It is a great thing to have Catholics and Protestants the world over, reciting on the Lord's Day the Apostles' Creed. That is a reminder that we belong together. That gives us hope that we shall some day come to-

gether. That Catholics and Protestants shall work together is undoubtedly in the plan of God. The Church exists upon the earth to establish the Kingdom of Righteousness and Peace and Joy. The Roman Catholics cannot do that work alone. We must help them. We cannot do it alone. They must help us. But the prejudices and misunderstandings are so serious for the present, that we cannot work together as we ought to work. In these years of separation, it is well that we and they should keep right on reciting—"I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth: and in Jesus Christ, His only Son our Lord."

If, then, we are to recite the Apostles' Creed in public worship, what is a Christian going to do who says he does not believe it? He believes some of it, but he does not believe all of it. What is he going to do? This is a practical question which must be fairly met. Men and women, in our day, are especially sensitive to the charge of hypocrisy and dishonesty. There are multitudes of men and women whose consciences are so sensitive that they will not consent to the recital of the Apostles' Creed because of their fear that they may be doing something dishonest. They are not certain about sundry things expressed in the Creed, and therefore they refuse to repeat it. What shall we do with these people? First of all we must respect them. No one with a sensitive conscience is ever to be derided. It is important that our worship shall be

sincere. "God is Spirit, and they who worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." We must never allow a trace of dishonesty to steal into our worship. Better a thousand times never repeat the Creed at all, than to repeat it with the feeling that you are doing a dishonest thing.

But it is possible for the conscience to become abnormal, and not infrequently men have confused notions in regard to what a creed really is.

In the first place, we must remind ourselves that a creed is not a legal document. Words are not used in a creed as they are used in a will or in a contract. In a legal document every word has a definite and fixed meaning. And the meaning is the same to everybody, and the meaning never changes. When it is stated that a man bequeaths or sells ten acres of land, the figure "ten" is definite, so is the word "acres" and so is the word "land." They can mean one thing, and one thing only. When a man signs a contract to deliver "one hundred thousand dollars' worth of grain," it is definite and fixed. But this is not the way in which language is used in a creed. In a creed the words are symbols, and they have no fixed meaning, for the reason that they stand for immeasurables. In legal contracts everything is measurable. In a creed nothing can be measured. We say "I believe."

But what do you mean by believe? The word "believe" has many grades and degrees of mean-



ing. The boy of six says "I believe," but he does not mean by that what the man of seventy means. The two believe in different ways. When you come to the word "God," every one has his own conception of God. The little girl of eight has her idea of God, and the aged woman of eighty has a conception that is deeper and richer because she pours into the word "God" an experience of a long life. And therefore when we say "I believe in God," each member of the congregation is giving a little different meaning from that given by all the others. Do not, then, be too literalistic in your interpretation of the Creed. The literalist always gets things into a mess when he deals with religious matters. There is no enemy of religion so mischievous and dangerous as a literalist. In a creed we are in the realm not of the letter but of the spirit.

In the second place, one must not stickle over details. It is wrong to press syllables. If we are to have any concerted action whatsoever in this world, we cannot overemphasize unessentials. For instance: our Government demands the existence of political parties, and if a man is going to act with any political party, he cannot insist that the platform of that party shall in every particular meet with his approbation. There will be some one plank in it, at least, to which he cannot subscribe. But he must not be offended at that. It is not the platform of a single man, it is the platform of a

party—a party made up of several millions of voters, and what right has any one voter to insist that the whole platform shall be just exactly what he wants? The very best thing that he can do is to accept the platform as a whole. He is in sympathy with the main policies laid down in the platform. He confesses he belongs to that party, not because he accepts every sentence in the platform, but because he is in sympathy with the things which the party aims to do. So also is it with religion. If we are going to live and work together, we cannot insist too stubbornly upon an agreement in details. You cannot have everything you want even in a local congregation made up of only a few hundred people. There will always be something that you do not like—something which you wish might be changed. But the Church does not belong to any one man, it belongs to the whole company of believers, and no one individual has the right to demand that everything shall be precisely what he wants.

Now when you have a creed repeated by hundreds of millions of human beings, how absurd it is to demand that every syllable shall be according to your preference! The Creed does not belong to you alone, it belongs to the whole vast army of the Lord, and the thing for you to do is not to quibble over a phrase that does not meet with your approval, but to ask yourself—"Do I accept the substance of its doctrine? Am I in harmony with its

spirit? Do I subscribe to the great truths which the creed endeavours to proclaim?" If a man can say "Yes" to all of these questions, he certainly has a right to repeat the Creed. He is not dishonest in repeating it, even though there are phrases which he would like to have altered. He is not a hypocrite because there are words which he would willingly drop out.

Let us see what is the substance of the Apostles' Creed: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth." There is no dispute about that. "I believe in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord." There is no debate over that. "I believe in the Holy Spirit." Nobody hesitates to say that. "I believe in the holy Catholic Church." No one objects to that, after he is told that "Catholic" does not mean "Roman Catholic." "I believe in the Communion of Saints." Nobody shrinks from that. "I believe in the Forgiveness of sins." Nobody questions that. "I believe in the Life everlasting." Everybody admits that. These are the seven great affirmations of the Apostles' Creed, and if a man can accept these, I see no reason why he should not repeat the whole Creed. These are the main things of the Creed. They are the substance of it. They are the truths which the Creed was written to declare.

There are only two points in the Creed at which many persons hesitate and those are the points which I now ask you to consider. Many people

cannot say—"I believe in the Resurrection of the body." They do not believe that this physical body is ever coming out of the grave, and therefore they cannot say the thing that is said in the Creed.

For the information of such persons, let me say that in the interpretation of the Creed a Protestant is under obligation to use the Scriptures. *Every* creed must be interpreted by the Scriptures. No creed can be placed above the Scriptures. If a creed teaches anything that is contrary to the clear teaching of the Scriptures, then the creed at that point must not be followed. Therefore, in the interpretation of this sentence in the Apostles' Creed, we are under bonds to get the teaching of the Scriptures. That teaching is emphatically set forth in the fifteenth chapter of Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians. In that chapter Paul expressly declares that the body that goes down into the grave is not the same kind of body that is coming up. The body that you sow is not the body that is to be. It is sown in corruption. It is raised in incorruption. It is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness, it is raised in power. It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body and "there is also"—mark the word '*also*'—"a spiritual body." What language could be clearer than that? "There is a physical body, and there is a spiritual body." And the spiritual body is the body that is going to rise. So says Paul—so must we all say. When, there-

fore, we say—"I believe in the resurrection of the body," we are not saying—"I believe in the resurrection of the *flesh*," but we are saying—"I believe in the resurrection of the spiritual body."

But some one says—"Did not the men who wrote the Creed believe in the resurrection of the flesh?" They undoubtedly did. Both in the Greek form of the Creed, and in the Latin form of the Creed, the word "body" is not used, but the word used is the word "flesh." The early Christians were certain that these physical bodies would come out of the grave. They could not conceive of personal identity continuing unless the same physical body survived. But we are able to conceive of personal identity surviving after the flesh has been thrown aside. What they were insistent upon saying was that—"personal identity after death will remain complete. We are not to be a spook or ghost or disembodied shade—we are to be real persons—our spirits will be embodied. We shall have a body which shall be the instrument of our will, through which our spirit shall express itself." That is what they wanted to say, and that is what we want to say. That is what we mean when we say—"I believe in the resurrection of the body." I, myself, am very fond of this word "body." I like it. I like to take it in my mouth. There is something so solid and substantial in the sound of it. "I believe in the resurrection of the body." I believe that I am going to be complete

after death. I am not going to lose anything of value in the grave. I am going to have another body, which will be the instrument of my purposes, and the medium through which my soul shall find adequate and glorious expression. I see no reason, then, why anyone should hesitate to join with the congregation in saying—"I believe in the resurrection of the body."

But suppose that even now the mind is still unsatisfied, and the scruples still remain. In such a case, I would suggest that that person drop the word "body" and substitute the word "dead." He can do this without marring the service. Let him say—"I believe in the resurrection of the dead." Every Christian is able to say that who believes in immortality. If anyone should say we have no right to use words in a sense different from the sense which was intended by the men who first made use of them, then we cannot use any ancient creed at all. We must give up the whole Apostles' Creed if we are to use the words in the sense in which they were originally intended. In the Creed, we say—"He ascended into heaven." The early Christians believed that the firmament was solid, and that heaven existed above this solid dome. We use the old words, but we have changed the meaning. The Creed says—"He descended into hell." The early Christians believed that hell was a locality down underneath the earth. We use the words, but we have changed the meaning. We

say—"I believe in the Communion of Saints." Nobody now living knows what was the meaning of those words to the man who wrote them. It may mean any one of four different things, and anyone is at liberty to give to the words whatever meaning he himself thinks is true. It is incontestable that we have a right to use words in a creed to which we attach a meaning different to the meaning which was in the mind of preceding generations.

But the phrase in the Apostles' Creed which is just now causing more perplexity than any other is—"Conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary." There are many persons who cannot say that, and because they cannot say that, they refuse altogether to repeat any of the Creed. I should say to all such persons, first of all, that you must interpret this sentence according to your understanding of the teaching of the Scriptures. If you believe that the Scriptures do not teach unambiguously the miraculous birth of Jesus, then you have a right to repeat this sentence even though you are an agnostic in regard to His supernatural birth. There are many scholars, honest men, who, after careful study of the Scriptures, are convinced that we have two traditions in the New Testament in regard to the birth of Jesus—one asserting that Joseph was His father, and the other asserting that Joseph was not His father. There are certain passages which can be quoted on both sides. What are you going to do with the genealogy of Matthew?

That puts Joseph in the list of His ancestors. What will you do with the genealogy of Luke which does the same thing? What will you do with the sentence written by Paul to the Romans that—"Jesus was born of the seed of David according to the flesh"? What shall we do with several sentences where Joseph is called Jesus' father? If you decide that the New Testament is ambiguous in regard to the birth of Jesus, you certainly have a right to repeat this part of the Apostles' Creed, giving it the interpretation which in your judgment the Scriptures permit you to give.

As for myself, I repeat what I have already said in a former sermon—I believe in the supernatural birth of Jesus, and therefore I have no difficulty whatever in repeating these words. But even if I were an agnostic in regard to the supernatural birth of Jesus, I should feel perfectly free to repeat these words, and should resent the intimation that I was dishonest or was juggling with words. There is no doubt as to what was in the mind of the man who wrote this particular sentence. "I believe in the miraculous birth of Jesus,"—that is what the Creed in the second century was understood to teach, and that is what nearly all Christians have understood it to teach. But if I were an agnostic in regard to the supernatural birth of Jesus, I should still be able to repeat these words.

We all agree that Jesus was sinless. On Him there was no taint of sin. When did He become



sinless? When was every taint removed? Was it when He was thirty, or when He was twelve, or when He was six, or when He was one? Was He holy in the hour of His birth? It is reasonable, I think, to believe that He was holy from the beginning. He was free from the taint of sin from the moment of His conception. The Psalmist said—"I was shapen in iniquity," but certainly Jesus was not. The Psalmist said that in sin his mother had conceived him, but that could not have been said of the mother of Jesus. Jesus was not shapen in iniquity. He was conceived in holiness. It was undoubtedly true, as Luke says, that "the Holy Spirit came upon her," and "the power of the Almighty overshadowed her." We can all believe that, and even though Joseph was His father according to the flesh, it is possible to believe that the Almighty infused into Jesus' being in the instant of His conception, the very holiness of Heaven, in which case why should we hesitate to say that He "was conceived by the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Holiness—the Spirit of God"?

And as for the expression "the Virgin Mary," there need be no difficulty with that. The "Virgin Mary" was the woman who was the mother of Jesus. From the end of the first century onward she was known as the "Virgin Mary" to distinguish her from the five other Marys who are mentioned in our New Testament, and from the scores of other Marys who, no doubt, lived in Palestine.

In our New Testament we have Mary of Magdala, and Mary of Bethany, and Mary the wife of Cleopas, and Mary the mother of John Mark, and Mary of Rome. Besides all these we have Mary the mother of Jesus. She became known as the "Virgin Mary." And so when I repeat the Creed, even though I were an agnostic in regard to the supernatural birth of Jesus, I should still be able to say that He was born of the "Virgin Mary." He was born of the woman known in history as the "Virgin Mary."

But there may be some who would not be able to repeat the phrase while they are still agnostic in regard to the supernatural birth, and to them I would suggest that you do this—drop the words "By the Holy Spirit." Drop the word "Virgin." Put all of your emphasis on "conceived" and "born" and "Mary." That is what the early Christians were endeavouring to say. They were not emphasizing in this Creed the miraculous birth of Jesus. They were combating a heresy known as "Docetism." It was the idea of the Docetists that Jesus' earthly body was a phantom. They believed in the Heavenly Christ, and in the earthly Jesus. But the Heavenly Christ was never born of a woman—never suffered—never died, and was never buried. Did you ever wonder why all these things are said in a Creed so short? This is the explanation. The Church of the second century was combating an error. It was asserting the real-

ity of the earthly life of Jesus. It was declaring its belief in His real manhood. That is why the early Christians said—"I believe He was conceived and born of a woman, and suffered under Pontius Pilate, and was dead and buried." You may drop out the word "Holy Spirit," and the word "Virgin," and at the same time assert the cardinal fact which the Creed was written to express.

The great heresy of the second century was a denial of the reality of Jesus' manhood. The great heresy of our day is a denial of Jesus' supremacy in life, business and industry, politics and diplomacy. It is the glory of the Apostles' Creed that it exalts Jesus. There are one hundred and nine words in the Creed, and seventy of them are devoted to Jesus Christ. All through the Middle Ages when the Gospels were very little read, this Creed was repeated, and in the Creed Jesus Christ was kept before men's eyes. A distinguished scholar has said that—"It was probably due more to the Creed than to the Gospels themselves that Jesus Christ has remained an object of the Christian faith." In the midst of the fogs, and in the deepest of the darkness, and in the wildest of the tempests, the Figure of Jesus has never been entirely lost, because the members of the Christian Church kept on saying—"I believe in Jesus Christ, His only Son our Lord." Let us go on to the end of our life repeating the Creed made sacred by the associations of so many generations.



V

ROMAN CATHOLICISM AND THE KU  
KLUX KLAN



ROMAN CATHOLICISM AND THE KU  
KLUX KLAN \*

I BEGIN this sermon by telling the purpose of it. It is not my aim to commend or condemn the Roman Catholic Church. I shall praise it some, and criticise it some, but that is not my chief object. My purpose is not to extol the Ku Klux Klan, nor to denounce it. I shall pick out things which I think are good, and also things which I think are bad, but that is not my main object. My supreme object is to throw light on a complex situation, to explain why the Klan is here, and what there is in the Roman Catholic Church to excite the Klan's antagonism.

The mind of the average man today is confused. That is because we are living in a hurry. We have no time to listen to anything through, or to read anything through, or to think anything through. We have a multitude of counsellors, and the air is filled with voices which are saying things. We snatch up a sentence today, and another one tomorrow, and we have no time to put the two sen-

---

\* Preached in the Broadway Tabernacle, Sunday morning, March 2, 1924.

tences together, and if we had the time we could not get them together, because they are mutually contradictory. The world is flooded with papers and magazines and books, and we have no time to read any of them through. We snatch up a paragraph here and a paragraph there, and we have no time to put the two paragraphs together, and if we had the time, we could not get them together because they say diametrically opposite things. Some people say the Klan is a good thing, and will do a lot of good. Other people say that the Klan is a bad thing and will do a lot of harm. Many men and women do not know what to think or say. I want to throw some light on the subject and help you to arrive at conclusions which are rational and Christian.

The Ku Klux Klan is not primarily an anti-Catholic organization. It started in Georgia nine years ago, and there are not many Catholics in Georgia. Only one-seventieth of the Christians in that State are Catholics. There are in Georgia twenty times more Methodists than Catholics, and forty times more Baptists than Catholics. The Catholics were not doing much damage in Georgia. Texas is one of the States in which the Klan has been most aggressive and prosperous, but there are not many Catholics in Texas. Only one quarter of the Christians in that State are Catholics. There are more Methodists there than Catholics, and there are ever so many more Baptists than Catholics. In



no State has the Klan run a more spectacular career than in the State of Oklahoma, but only one-ninth of the Christians in Oklahoma are Catholics. There are twice as many Methodists as Catholics there, and nearly three times as many Baptists.

This would indicate that the Klan is not solely an anti-Catholic organisation. It is first of all a patriotic organisation—an Americanisation organisation—a reform organisation—a law-enforcement organisation. (Its supreme aim is to make America fit for Americans to live in.) (It is not to be wondered at that such an organisation came into existence.) America has been, and still is, in bad shape. It is foolish to say that it is not. Look at the list of murders! No other country under heaven has such a list. Look at the list of burglaries committed not simply in New York City, but in every city of the country. No other nation can show records blacker than that. Look at the list of our lynchings. No other civilised nation has a record equal to ours. Look at the list of our divorces. No other Christian nation has a record so shameful. Look at the list of our strikes. In no other country is the conflict between labour and capital so implacable and so bitter. Look at the list of our scandals—our commercial scandals, and our political scandals. One after another they come, until the heart of the people is made sick. Every few months a new form of rottenness is uncovered. Our corruption “is rank—it smells to heaven.” And then look at

our lawlessness. It is not simply the Volstead Act that is flouted and trampled on, but *all* law. We are becoming, more and more, a lawless people.

And where are we to look for relief? Certainly not to the national Government. There is no balm in *that* Gilead. Our Government is so constructed that a little company of foolish and stubborn men can tie it into a hard knot, so that democracy is incapable of functioning at all. The national government is paralysed again and again by the spirit of partisanship. We cannot look for help to our political parties. Both of the great political parties are morally bankrupt. What can they do to help us out of our distresses? We cannot go to the courts. Our Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, said the other day that we make twelve thousand new laws every year in this country. He called attention to the confusion resulting from clashing interpretations and judgments. The processes of our judicature are so technical and complicated, that lawsuits drag on interminably. Many of our leading lawyers have been telling us for years that a poor man stands little chance of getting justice in our courts. A rich man, or a rich corporation, can appeal a case from one court to another, until the poor litigant is either in the poorhouse or in his grave. The administration of criminal law has broken down in various parts of the country. Only a few of the criminals are ever caught, and of those who are caught only a few are convicted, and

of the few who are convicted only a small fraction ever serve out their sentence. It seems hopeless to secure justice through the courts. We cannot go to the Churches. The Churches are numerous and active, but they are unable to focus their moral forces on the spot where it is most needed. We have all sorts of organisations created for numberless good purposes, but all of them stand impotent in the presence of this flood of lawlessness and godlessness which is sweeping across the land.

Over in Italy, at the close of the war, things got into a mess, and the political parties did nothing but squabble and wrangle, and the politicians and the statesmen did little but haggle and gabble, until finally a strong man—Mussolini by name,—came forward and said, "I will attend to things myself." Immediately millions of Italians cried, "We will back you up." And even the King of Italy bowed down before Mussolini. The Ku Klux Klan is the Mussolini of America. There is a vast volume of discontent in this country with things as they are, and the discontent expresses itself in the Ku Klux Klan. This is why the Klan is so large. I am not a Klansman, and therefore I do not know how many Klansmen there are. I have been told by some that there are 4,500,000. It is occasionally asserted that there may be as many as 6,000,000. There are prophets who declare with confidence that there will be 12,000,000 by the time of the election next November. Let us

assume that there are 5,000,000. I am told that each Klansman pays ten dollars initiation fee and six dollars and a half for his regalia. If there are 5,000,000 Klansmen, they have paid in over \$80,000,000. An organisation of these dimensions does not come by accident or chance. Men do not pay \$80,000,000 for the fun of it. There must be some powerful, inciting cause. There must be some persuasive argument to induce so many men at such a cost to enter this organisation. There must be some solid ground on which a man stands when he puts on a hood.

It is foolish to say that all these men are bigots and fanatics. There are bigots and fanatics among them, but the majority are not. It is absurd to say that they are dunces and lunatics. Theodore Roosevelt used to say that every great movement had a fringe of lunacy. He knew, because he had had experience with the Bull Moose Party. It is ridiculous to say that all these Klansmen are grafters and exploiters. There are many, no doubt, of that description, but not all are such. The majority of the members of the Ku Klux Klan are sensible and earnest men, honest and honourable, and have the welfare of their country at heart. Do not believe the people who tell you that the Ku Klux Klan is made up of brainless mischief-makers and fools.

When the Klan entered upon its work of making America more thoroughly American, it discovered

that there are three classes of people which cause no little trouble—the Negroes, the Jews, and the Roman Catholics. The Klan opposes the Negroes not because of their religion, but because they are Negroes. It opposes the Jews not because of their religion, but because they are Jews. Catholics are of all races, and therefore when the Klan opposes them, it would seem as though Catholics are opposed because of their religion. I am not dealing here either with the Negroes or the Jews. I am confining myself solely to a consideration of the Roman Catholics, because the Ku Klux Klan gives the impression that a certain class of Americans are being discriminated against because of their religion. The enemies of the Klan are always saying that it is denying freedom of worship and liberty of conscience, and is insisting upon a religious test which the Constitution of the United States condemns. But all such talk is not fair to the Klan. I am not a Klansman myself, I repeat, but we ought to deal fairly with the Klan. The Klan is not opposing Catholics because of their form of worship. I have seen some rather bigoted Protestants, but I have never yet found a Protestant who was not perfectly willing that Catholics should worship God in the way which they think best.

The worship which you see in the Roman Catholic Church is Christianity in an Italian dress. There was no rosary in Palestine, nor was there

any crucifix. There were no pictures and statues there in the days of Jesus or His Apostles. There was never a celebration of the mass in Palestine in the days of Peter and James, of John and Paul. All those things came from Italy. But Americans have no objection to Catholics making use of candles and incense, holy water and the sanctus bell, and the gorgeous robes of the priest. ✱ The Klan is not opposing liberty of worship, nor is it endeavouring to curtail liberty of religious thought. Protestants do not deny the right of Catholics to hold doctrines they believe to be true—the doctrine of the Adoration of the Virgin Mary, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, the doctrine of Penance, the doctrine of Purgatory, the doctrine of Transubstantiation, the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. Protestants are entirely willing that Catholics should believe these things, if they can.

What is it, then, the Ku Klux Klan opposes in the Roman Catholic Church? It is its form of government. And the reason it opposes its form of government is because that form of government can be manipulated for political ends. It is worth our while to pause long enough at this point to get a clear idea of what the Roman Catholic form of government is. In the Catholic Church all authority is vested in the hierarchy. Roman Catholic laymen have nothing at all to do with the government of the Catholic Church. The hierarchy is a

body of officials consisting of various orders, or ranks, each order being subordinate to the order immediately above it. At the bottom of the hierarchy are the priests, above these the bishops, above these the archbishops, above these the metropolitans, above these the patriarchs, and at the top of the system, crowning all, is a supreme autocrat known as the Pope. Now, this hierarchy is a close corporation; that is, it perpetuates itself. The laity cannot put anybody into the hierarchy. The hierarchy reaches down and chooses whom it will. It is a military machine in the sense that the supreme virtue of Roman Catholic officials is obedience. That was the supreme virtue in the Roman Empire. That was one of the secrets of its conquering strength. Cæsar expected all his officials to obey. We have retained the Roman tradition in our army. In the military world the supreme virtue is obedience. Every military officer obeys his superior. A corporal does not argue with his captain, nor a captain with his colonel, nor a colonel with a brigadier-general. Every man obeys. "Theirs not to make reply, theirs not to reason why." That is the way things are done in the army, and we say that it is fine. We claim that such obedience is necessary. An army cannot conquer unless every officer obeys his superior. The Roman Catholics retain that idea in their Church. They believe that obedience is fine indispensable in the ecclesiastical world, just as we acknowledge it to be indispensable in the army.

Every Roman official, therefore, obeys his superior. It is a wonderfully efficient machine.

But to make it immeasurably more efficient, the priest is endowed with extraordinary and amazing powers. He can take a wafer and convert it into the real body of the Son of God, and in order to have eternal life it is necessary that a faithful Catholic shall partake of the body of his Lord. The priest consequently has authority to open and close the doors of heaven. His power extends not only to the life that now is, but to the world that lies beyond the grave. He can, by the prayers which he offers at the altar, shorten the duration of the sufferings of souls in the spiritual world. And most wonderful of all, he can forgive sins. In order to forgive sins, he must know what the sins are, and therefore the confessional becomes indispensable. Every Roman Catholic must go into the confessional at least once a year. Most good Catholics go to confession many times a year, but every Catholic is by the law of the Church compelled to go to confession at least once a year. This gives the priest the right to go down into the mind. He can find out what a Catholic has been thinking, planning, hoping. He not only can find these things out, but he can also give advice. He can give more than advice—he can give commands issued by his superior.

You must take all that in in order to understand the Ku Klux Klan. You must bear in mind that



the Roman Catholic machine is tremendously efficient, and it is because of its efficiency that millions of men are afraid of it. They are afraid of it for the same reason that millions of people were afraid of the German military machine. It was so fearfully efficient that it terrorised the world. The Roman Catholic ecclesiastical machine is so efficient that multitudes stand in fear of it. It is the most wonderful machine ever created by the genius of man. It was not created in a year, or in a hundred years. A long line of able men extending over sixteen hundred years have built their brain into this machine. It is a well-nigh perfect engine, created for the exercise of conquering power. Men are afraid of it because they think that it might be manipulated for political ends. Every Klansman knows that there is a papal legate who lives at the door of Congress in Washington; that there are two cardinals in America (by the time these words appear in print there will be four); ninety-four bishops and 22,545 priests, and that all of those have sworn obedience to the Pope, and the Pope is a foreigner. The Pope is an Italian. You must grasp *that*, in order to understand why many men are opposed to the Catholic Church.

The fear that the Roman Catholic machine may be manipulated for political ends is deepened by the knowledge that it has often been so manipulated in Europe. In Europe the Roman Catholic Church has been in politics for more than a thou-

sand years. Nobody who knows history would dispute that. It is an open book, and the whole world can read it. All through the Middle Ages the Roman Catholic Church was the "political boss" of Europe. The Pope crowned kings and deposed them at his own good pleasure. The Pope absolved people from allegiance to their king whenever he chose to do so. The picture of Henry IV, Emperor of Germany, standing barefoot in the month of January, in the courtyard of Pope Hildebrand at Canossa near the end of the eleventh century, waiting three days until the Pope chose to give him an audience and absolution, is a picture which will never fade out of the memory of mankind. That is the way the Roman Catholic Church lorded it over states and political rulers in the Middle Ages. But it is not necessary to go back so far to find illustrations of the way in which the ecclesiastical machine is manipulated for political ends. The ~~great~~ Napoleon had a struggle with the Pope, and so did the Little Napoleon—Napoleon III. Thayer in his "Life of Cavour" tells of the long struggle which that great statesman had with the Pope. The mighty Bismarck of Germany found himself again and again face to face with the Pope. Even to the present hour the Roman Catholic Church is in European politics. In nearly every European country there is a clerical party fighting openly for the Church in the national Parliament. Poincaré has been compelled to carry on negoti-

ations with the Pope, and Mussolini, just now, is working hand in hand with the Pope. He has got to do it in order to carry his enterprises through.

There is a widespread fear in America that possibly the Roman Catholic Church is in politics here. It is in politics in Europe. Roman Catholics are always saying that the Church is always the same. Whenever a Roman Catholic says that, a Protestant begins to sniff the smoke of the fires of Smithfield. If it be true that the Roman Catholic Church is always the same, we have reason to be afraid. Roman Catholics are always saying that the Roman Catholic Church is the same in every country. We know what it is in Spain, and if it is the same in every country, then there is ground for fears. The Roman Catholic Church is not openly in American politics. So far as one's eyes can see, the Catholic Church is not so deeply in politics here as is the Protestant Church. Our Protestant clergymen and laymen go to their states' capitals and Washington far more frequently in their efforts to influence legislation than do Roman Catholic priests and laymen. There is more political preaching in Protestant Churches than in Catholic Churches. There are Protestant ministers, here and there throughout the country, who do not hesitate to preach even partisan sermons. But such a sermon is never heard in a Roman Catholic Church. That is a form of scandal which is unknown in Catholic Churches.

Roman Catholics all say that their Church is not in politics, and that is true so far as the eyes can see, but there are multitudes of Americans who fear that the Roman Catholic Church is in politics secretly—that underneath the surface she is everlastingly at work manipulating forces for her own aggrandisement. And now and then there are symptoms which make it seem that such a surmise may not be altogether groundless. Unbiased students of the history of New York have arrived at the conclusion that there is a very close connection between Tammany Hall and the Catholic hierarchy. There are many things to point in that direction. Every New Yorker remembers well that there was once a Roman Catholic Mayor by the name of Mitchel who dared to defy the hierarchy, and no one is likely to forget the fact that as a consequence his political life was cut short. There are many Americans who feel that the Catholic Church is here what it is in every other country: it is in politics, but not openly here as it is in Europe.

You must take this fear into account in order to understand the methods of the Klan. The Klan itself is based on patriotism, but its methods are determined by its fears. Fear is not amenable to reason. You cannot argue with men who are afraid. Under the spell of fear men will do all sorts of foolish things. The Klansmen put on hoods because they are afraid. They are afraid of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. They know that

Rome can strike, and that when she strikes she strikes hard. Woe to the man who dares offend her! In the theatre you can make a Protestant clergyman a nincompoop or hypocrite, and nothing happens. If a Roman Catholic priest were ever made contemptible on the stage, the Roman Catholics would come near to tearing the house down. They will not permit any slur on their Church in motion pictures. A Protestant clergyman can be portrayed as a fool on the screen, but no Roman Catholic priest is ever slandered in the movies. After one such transgression against the Catholic Church, a moving picture house would go out of business. Let a Protestant minister get into a scandal and his picture is on the front page of every newspaper. Let a Roman Catholic priest get into a scandal, and if he is mentioned at all, he will be mentioned in small print on an inside page, and that reference to him will disappear after the first edition. Let a Protestant minister pass from a Protestant Church into the Catholic Church, and it is proclaimed as great news in big headlines on the front page of all the papers in the country. Let a Roman Catholic priest,—for instance a Paulist father,—pass from the Catholic into the Protestant Church, and even the papers of New York City, alert as they are, have the greatest difficulty in finding news like that. These are notorious facts, and they excite fear. The outbursts against the Catholic Church which are periodic are due to

the fear which men feel in the presence of the Roman Catholic machine.

This fear takes on the form of exasperation because of the attitude of the Roman Catholic hierarchy to our public schools. The hierarchy believes that no education is complete without religion. It is convinced that the paramount element in education is religion. It feels that there is no education which will preserve our Republic which ignores religion. In all this the hierarchy is right. In all this I agree with the hierarchy entirely. Religious education is indispensable if our Republic is to endure. The Catholic hierarchy, however, believes that no education is effectively religious except dogmatic instruction after the Roman type. Children to be really educated religiously must be instructed by Roman Catholics in the particular dogmas of the Catholic religion. Not only must the instruction be dogmatic, but the atmosphere of the school must be religious. The hierarchy places great emphasis upon atmosphere. The child mind must be immersed in a Catholic atmosphere. It is the atmospheric pressure which moulds the mind and shapes the heart. Therefore the instruction must be given by Brothers and Sisters dressed in the garb of the Church, in order that the insignia of religion may always be before the eyes of the boys and the girls in the formative years of their growth.

For this reason Catholic boys and girls cannot

properly be educated in public schools. They must be educated in Catholic schools known as "parochial" schools. Since the parochial schools are the only religious schools, the hierarchy has decided that these are indispensable for the well-being of Catholic children. They cost a deal of money, and it is not fair that Catholics should be compelled to contribute to the public school fund, and in addition support their own schools. In justice there ought to be a division of the public school fund. That is the conviction of the hierarchy, and so from time to time an effort is made to divide the public school fund. A strong effort was made in New York by Bishop Hughes in the year 1840. It came to nothing, but it has never been forgotten. Similar efforts have been made from time to time in various parts of the country. They have not been successful, but other efforts will be made. That lies in the back of the hierarchy's mind. That is a feature of the hierarchy's program. That is something that is going to be put over as soon as circumstances permit. Protestants are very sensitive at this point. They do not believe in parochial schools. They think it is a mistake to segregate children according to their religion. They have no desire to support by their money parochial schools. The bulk of the taxes is paid in this country by Protestants. The average Catholic family is larger than the average Protestant family, and so, if the Catholics could secure a *pro rata* distribution of the

public school fund, Protestants would be paying in large part for the education of Roman Catholic children in the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. That is something which Protestants do not want to do.

What makes the irritation more acute is the fact that Roman Catholics have a fervent ambition to teach in our public schools. This seems surprising. The hierarchy calls public schools "godless" schools. That is its favourite term. The schools are too godless for Roman Catholic boys and girls to be educated in. They do not seem to be too godless for Catholic young women to teach in. Roman Catholic young women by the thousands are eager to teach in the public schools. Moreover, Roman Catholic men seem to desire with great earnestness to serve on the public school boards in our cities. Where these places are elective, they do their best to get elected. In many cities in the country there are Roman Catholics on the school board, and sometimes the chairman of the board is a member of the Church which condemns public schools as "godless." It is because of this inrush of Roman Catholic teachers, and because of this ambition of Roman Catholic men to serve on boards of education that some people fear that there is a conspiracy on foot to throw the whole public-school system in the hands of the Catholic Church so that it may be broken down, thus making people more willing to adopt the policy of parochial



schools. Another feature that makes the situation more vexing is the fact that the young women who want to teach in our public schools are not educated in the public schools. They receive their education in Roman Catholic schools, and the Catholic schools make special efforts to fit them for public school service, arranging the curriculum in such a way as to enable them to pass the examinations, and secure certificates that will make them eligible for public school positions. This makes many people afraid.

In our own city of New York we have a Roman Catholic Mayor, and it is he who appoints the school board consisting of seven members. Four out of seven of the present board are Roman Catholics. It was carefully looked after that the control of the school board should be lodged in Roman Catholic hands. The result is that the Superintendent of our public schools is a Catholic. A majority of the Associate Superintendents are also Catholics. There are thousands of Catholic young women teaching today in the public schools of this city. In many cities the situation is the same. This does not make for good feeling. This stirs up resentment and opposition. This makes men more willing to join some organisation like the Ku Klux Klan which promises to keep Roman Catholics from overthrowing our public schools.

We who are not members of the Klan sympathize with the Klan in its enthusiastic support of

our public schools. Many of us believe that the policy of the Roman Catholic Church on this point is mistaken and mischievous. It is a great blunder to segregate children according to the religion of their parents, and educate them in different schools. It is a good thing for Catholics and Protestants to mingle. The more they mingle with one another, the better it will be for us all, and the better it will be for the Republic. It does a Protestant good to be intimately acquainted with a number of noble Roman Catholics. It gives him a higher estimate of the whole Catholic Church. It does a Catholic good to know a number of noble-hearted Protestants. It helps him to understand the character of the Protestant Church. It is a good thing for Catholic children and Protestant children to play together, study together, recite together, go on hikes together. Let them play and study together until they are sixteen, and then they will not suspect one another in the later years. The Catholics will not think that the Protestants are infidels dominated by the spirit of the devil, and the Protestants will not think that the Catholics have hoofs and horns. The hierarchy is mistaken in its policy of parochial schools. It is driving a wedge into the body of our citizenship. It is jeopardizing the future of our Republic. Roman Catholics must remember that the public school is one of the sacred institutions of the American Republic—that Protestants are determined that it shall be preserved at

all costs. And therefore just so long as the hierarchy is the enemy of the public school system, and makes earnest and determined efforts to segregate Catholic children in Catholic schools, just so long will there be a fear which will express itself in such organisations as the Ku Klux Klan.

Catholics ought to understand also that the attitude of the Catholic hierarchy to Protestantism is provocative of bad feeling. The Catholic Church ignores us. It does not admit that we are in the Church at all. Our Churches are only religious organisations outside the Church which Jesus Christ founded. The hierarchy says that I am not a clergyman. I have never been properly ordained to do the work of a minister of Christ. We have in our Church a celebration of the Lord's Supper, but that amounts to nothing. There is no valid celebration of the Lord's Supper except in a Roman Catholic Church. Moreover, Roman Catholics hold themselves aloof from us. They will not worship with us. They will neither pray with us nor sing with us. This attitude does not make for good feeling.

Moreover, the hierarchy snubs us—snubs us whenever it gets the chance. Whenever Protestants make an effort to get closer to the Roman Catholic Church, Protestantism is snubbed. Even the great Anglican Church has been snubbed more than once. That is one of the great Churches of the world—wonderfully rich in scholarship, in de-

votion, in piety. It has made a contribution to the life of mankind which cannot be measured. It has added immeasurably to the glory of the whole Church of God. And yet the Roman Catholic Church snubs the Anglican Church whenever communicants of the Anglican make an effort to secure recognition. *Why?*

The Catholic hierarchy slanders us. It is always saying things which are not so. Only last January a distinguished Roman Catholic priest proclaimed in St. Patrick's Cathedral that Protestantism had utterly failed. There are some Roman Catholic priests who take great delight in saying a thing like that. That is said often in their papers, and it is said in their schools. And it is proclaimed from many of their pulpits that Protestantism has failed. Roman Catholics are told by their ecclesiastical leaders that Protestantism is *petering out*—that it is on its last legs—that it is sure to come to nothing, and that by and by the Christian world will be Catholic. I should think that a Roman Catholic would be more humble, with Southern Italy lying in full view. I should think that a Roman Catholic would not vaunt himself, with all Spain lying before the world's eyes. I should think a Catholic would not be puffed up, with Southern Ireland lying out in the light of day. I should think a Catholic would not behave himself unseemly with Mexico so clearly visible. I should think a Roman Catholic would not brag. If Protestantism has

failed, what can be said of Roman Catholicism? We know that the two leading nations of the world are Great Britain and the United States, and both of these are Protestant. Hilaire Belloc, a well-known English Roman Catholic writer, has recently said in a London paper that "not much over one-twentieth of the population of Britain is Catholic," and according to Catholic figures, only one-sixth of the population of our own country is Catholic. It is worth one's while to look at the procession of the Christian nations, and take note of the fact that the two nations that march at the front are Protestant, and that the inefficient and belated nations which bring up in the rear of the procession are Catholic

Moreover, Roman Catholic writers and speakers stir up bad feeling by boasting of the nearness of the day when Roman Catholicism is going to control our Republic. It was in the year 1910, that the late Father Vaughan, speaking in the city of Montreal, boldly boasted that the time was coming when Catholics were going to control the United States. That unfortunate remark was at once snatched up, and for the last fourteen years it has been rolling like thunder over this land. All such boastfulness does not make for good feeling. There is an arrogance about the Roman Catholic hierarchy which it is difficult for many men to endure. Now right through this sermon I am not speaking about Roman Catholic laymen, I am not

thinking of them, I am thinking solely of the hierarchy. It is the hierarchy that stirs up the bad feeling, and causes Ku Klux Klansmen to wear hoods. The Roman Catholic hierarchy has the arrogance of Cæsar, and it also has his autocratic spirit.

Shortly after the end of the World War, a group of representatives of the Protestant Churches thought that the time was ripe to make an earnest effort to bring all Christians of the world closer together. The skies were dark, and men's hearts were filled with misgivings. It looked as though civilisation were going to pieces, and that there was no hope anywhere unless it could be found in the Christian Church. But the Christian Church was divided, and these men said to themselves—"Let us make an effort to bring Greek Catholics and Roman Catholics and Protestants into closer co-operation for the upbuilding of the Kingdom of God." And so a Commission started out to visit all the branches of the Christian Church, asking them to express a willingness to participate in some great world conference. The response which this Commission met was swift and most cordial. Even the Greek Church which through centuries has been most seclusive, gave an immediate and friendly answer. Wherever the Commission went the door was thrown open and delightful hospitality was shown. There was only one closed door in the whole Christian world, and that was the door of the Vatican. The Pope was very courteous in

his reply, but the substance of his reply was this—"We cannot talk with you about such matters. We cannot sit down at the table with you. We cannot go into the same room with you." I count that the most tragic event in the history of our generation. I do not forget the Great War. It was a tragedy, but it was the creation of governments. But when the Pope said to this Commission of Protestants—"I am not willing to sit down with you, or to talk with you about any measure of co-operation for building up the Kingdom of Love," he did something which will not be forgotten. Here was the man who claims to be the "Vicar of Jesus Christ," Jesus Christ's supreme representative on this planet—a man who claims to be able to speak infallibly whenever he speaks on a question of faith or morals—a man who represents 200,000,000 human beings who claim to be Christians, and this is the man who says to a company of his brother Christians that he is not willing to sit down with them, or have any conversation with them in regard to the work of Christ. ~~109~~

Why does the head of the Catholic Church act and talk like that? It is because he looks upon us as rebels. Cæsar always treated rebels in just such a manner. Cæsar never deigned to converse with rebels. A general has only one set of terms for a rebel, and that is unconditional surrender. That is the condition the Pope of Rome imposes. He says to us—"Unconditional surrender! Get down on

your knees, confess that you are rebels. Swear your allegiance to me, and then I will deign to talk with you." That is the spirit of the Catholic hierarchy, uttering itself through the Pope. It is because of the machinery of the hierarchy, the politics of the hierarchy, the attitude of the hierarchy, and the temper of the hierarchy, that millions of American citizens are today carrying a banner, on which they have emblazoned—"Native, White, Protestant Supremacy!" *not equality!*

What, then, ought your attitude to be towards the Klan? If you will take my advice, you will keep out of it. I say to every man—"Keep away from it. Have nothing to do with it." I speak to you first of all not as a Christian, but as an American citizen. I urge you to keep out of it. If any of you are in it, then I urge you to get out of it, and get out of it as soon as you can. It is a dangerous movement. It stirs up the very worst passions. It is always dangerous to work in the dark against your fellow men. When you work in the dark, bad men will take advantage of the darkness and do many a diabolical thing. The Klan is an organisation that works in the dark. ~~Bad~~ men of the Klan take advantage of the darkness to do lawless things, and other bad men in the community take advantage of the darkness to perpetrate atrocities too. That is the result in every State in which the Klan has enrolled a great membership. All sorts of bad



things have been done, and it is impossible to say who is responsible. But no matter what is done, the responsibility is invariably rolled upon the Klan, and this is inevitable. It is a part of the price which men must pay who put on hoods and ride in the dark. It is a dangerous movement. It kindles fires, and we do not know how far these fires will run. They may set the very framework of our Republic blazing.

Moreover, the movement is futile. It will come to nothing. It seems to be prosperous today, but it will some day burst like a bubble. We have had such movements before. There was a Native American movement in the thirties and forties; there was a Know-Nothing movement in the fifties; there was an American Protective Association movement in the nineties, and that came to nothing. All came to nothing. They had a few temporary successes and then they collapsed. That will be the fate of the Ku Klux Klan. It will win a few fleeting victories. It will pull a few Catholics here and there out of office. It will keep other Catholics from getting in, but the day of its successes is a short one. It is doomed to come to nothing. No such movement can permanently succeed. It will not harm the Catholic Church at all. It will strengthen it. It will solidify it. There are tens of thousands of indifferent Catholics that care very little for the priest and the Church, but once attack the Roman Catholic Church, and immediately you

kindle a new devotion in these men. You drive them back into the arms of the priests.

Moreover, such a movement awakens the sympathy of millions of Protestants. The average Protestant church member is a fair-minded man. He does not want injustice done to anybody. He wants to give every man a square deal. He does not believe in striking men in the dark. I conjecture that only a small proportion of the Ku Klux Klan members are members of any Protestant Church. They are for the most part outsiders, nominally Protestants, but not Protestants in heart, and these men working in the dark will only arouse the sympathy of other Protestants for the Roman Catholic Church. There has always been a stream of money flowing into the Roman Catholic Church out of Protestant purses. We have always helped them in their various enterprises. The Ku Klux Klan by striking them in the dark will bring multitudes of Protestants closer to them, and it would not be surprising if the Roman Catholic Church would receive more Protestant money within the next ten years than in any other decade of the last century. If I were a Catholic, I should never lose a minute's sleep over the Klu Klux Klan. It will flourish for a season and then pass away, leaving behind it a great aftermath of suspicion and hate, with the Roman Catholic Church stronger than ever. *IT HAS COME TO PASS*

Let me now speak to you as Christians. Have

nothing to do with the Ku Klux Klan. It is not a Christian thing to fight in the dark. We are Sons of the Day. We are not Sons of the Night. Stand out in the full light of the sun. Jesus of Nazareth never wore a hood, nor did any of His Apostles, nor did Martin Luther, nor John Calvin, nor John Knox, nor any of the heroes of the Reformation era. The heroes and heroines of Protestantism have always been Children of the Day, looking out upon the world with unveiled faces, and showing the world the light of Heaven shining in their eyes. Whenever you are going to fight a thing that you believe to be wrong, put on the whole armour of God, and stand out so that your enemy can see you.

It is not Christian to accuse a man of diabolical intentions because he does not agree with you in opinion concerning the wisdom or unwisdom of the parochial school policy. There are many Protestants who do not believe that it is altogether a bad thing to have these parochial schools. They think that the hierarchy is doing us a service by the emphasis which it is placing upon religious education, and that many Catholic boys and girls are getting in parochial schools the very sort of education which they are most in need of. There is a difference in opinion in regard to parochial schools, and if a Catholic believes in them we have no right to say that he would like to burn us at the stake, and that his one desire is to re-establish the Inquisi-

tion, and bring back the darkness of the Middle Ages. That is a mean thing to think and say.

It is not Christian to condemn men for a conjectural crime. It is wicked to accuse Roman Catholics of disloyalty because the head of the Church is a foreigner. From the beginning of our Government to the present hour, Roman Catholics have been as loyal as Protestants. In 1776 they fought side by side for the deliverance of their country from bondage to Britain. In 1861 they fought side by side for the preservation of the Union. In 1898 Protestants and Catholics sailed together for the liberation of Cuba. And in 1917 Roman Catholic boys and Protestant boys crossed the Atlantic together, fought on French soil together, and died on the battlefield together. I have walked through the great American cemeteries in France, and I have seen the graves of the Protestant boys and the graves of the Catholic boys side by side, with the Star Spangled Banner floating over them all. It is a dastardly thing to accuse Catholics of disloyalty because the Pope is a foreigner!

It is absurd to assume because Catholics are obedient to their superior in spiritual matters, that they are equally obedient in political affairs. There have always been in every country devout Roman Catholics who have refused to obey the Pope in political things. There are more Catholics of that sort in the world today than ever before, and there

are more of them in the United States than in any other country in the world. [Multitudes of Catholics resent fiercely the intimation that they would obey the Pope should the Pope ever advise a course of action detrimental to our Republic. I have not the shadow of a doubt that if the Pope should ever issue such a command, the Roman Catholics of this country almost to a man would refuse to obey him.

It is un-christian to say things that are not so. It is always being asserted by reckless individuals that Roman Catholics are getting possession of our Government. Why should any man of intelligence say a thing so senseless as that? Our Government has existed one hundred and forty-eight years, and the Roman Catholics have not made much progress in getting possession of it. If their ambition is to take possession of it, they have yet a long way to travel. In certain cities where the population is overwhelmingly Catholic, the local Government is in the hands of the Catholics. That is just what you have got to expect. We are living in a country where the majority rules, and if the majority of voters are Catholics, you would hardly expect them to vote for none other than Protestant candidates. If three-quarters of the population of the City of Boston are Catholics, why should not the government of Boston be Catholic? What is the use of squealing if we are outvoted? Why not play the game? But when it comes to the national Government, the Catholics are surely not in

possession yet. There are ninety-six members of the Senate, and only seven of them are Catholic. The Methodists have twenty-three Senators, the Presbyterians have fourteen. These two denominations have five times as many Senators as the Catholics, although there are more Catholics in this country than Methodists and Presbyterians put together. There are four hundred and thirty-five members of the House of Representatives. Only thirty-eight of these are Catholics, ninety-six of the Representatives are Methodists, and fifty-nine of them are Presbyterians. There are four times more Methodists and Presbyterians in the House than Catholics. And yet there are more Catholics in the country than Presbyterians and Methodists combined. And when you come to the Cabinet, there is not a single Catholic in the company of the President's official advisers. The Catholics have never been overrepresented in our history, and most of the time they have been underrepresented. There has never been a Roman Catholic in the White House. Why, then, go on talking about the Catholics taking possession of Washington?

~~St.~~ Paul has given us a good principle of conduct. "If there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things." It is very difficult to judge the Roman Catholic Church, because it is such a conglomeration of good and bad. It is difficult to be fair to it because it is such a mixture of piety and worldliness. It has written some of the

worst chapters of history ever written, and it has written some of the very brightest. It has in it some of the best men alive, and it has also in it some of the worst men. The Christian thing to do is to think of Catholicism at its best. There is much virtue in it. Let us think of that. There is much that is worthy of praise. Let us pick it out and praise it. Let us think not simply of the ward-heelers, and the Catholics that are bigoted and benighted. Let us think of the late Chief Justice White, one of the best judges that ever adorned that position. Let us think of Mayor Dever, one of the best Mayors Chicago has recently had. Let us think of General O'Ryan, one of the great peace workers of our generation. Let us think of Dr. John S. Coyle, a man high up in the ranks of the Knights of Columbus, and who is one of the strongest defenders of the Eighteenth Amendment.

Some people are crazy about the Roman Catholic Church. They use a muck rake, and rake together all the smut and filth which they find in the alleys of the Roman Catholic world. God punishes them for doing that. Such people are thrown into panic. They become the victims of an hysteria which is dangerous and pitiable. ~~They look under their bed every night before they go to sleep to see if there is a Jesuit there.~~ Life becomes miserable. The whole world swarms with enemies. This is the penalty that God inflicts upon men who always think of their fellow men at their worst.

Overcome evil with good. Whatever of evil exists in the Roman Catholic Church cannot be overcome by evil. If Roman Catholics fight in the dark, then that is wrong. You will not make the world better by committing another wrong. If they fight in the dark, let them do it. You fight in the full blaze of the day. There is only one way to overcome the Roman Catholic Church, and that is to develop a deeper piety and higher morality than theirs. We can conquer their obedience only by a higher obedience. We can conquer their sacrifice only by a more complete sacrifice. We can get possession of the mind and heart of the world only by possessing a more rational and fervent love.

Have faith in God. Have faith in goodness. Have faith in love. Have faith in men. The Roman Catholic Church will not always be what it has been, and still is. Some of the things which it teaches will some day be sloughed off. Men will not always be willing to believe that a priest, no matter what his character is, can convert a bit of bread into the body of Christ. Men may be able to believe that through a thousand years, but they will not believe it always. Man is a rational creature. He will not always accept a belief like that. Men will not always believe that a priest saying prayers at the altar can shorten the duration of suffering in the other world. Some men will believe that through a thousand years, but the human mind will not retain it forever. That will be





UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY



138 623

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY